3 1223 00220 1656

BOOK NO. 780.2 W12GL 2 ACCESSION 11280

FORM 3431 30M 11-39



SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

Careful usage of books is expected, and any injury or loss is to be paid for by the borrower. A charge of two cents will be made for each day, or fraction thereof, that this book is kept overtime.

SEE DATE WHEN DUE BELOW

This book may be renewed if not requested by other borrowers.

Feb18'41

Feb25'49.

Report change of address promptly.

F 3439—150M—11-39

Walter L. Bolls, Ph. D.

Richard Wagner

LIFE OF RICHARD WAGNER:

BY

WM. ASHTON ELLIS

VOL. IV.

St. Paul's Library

LONDON

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO., LTD.

1904.

780.2 W12gL2
v.4
Glasenapp, Carl
Friedrich, 1847-1915.
Life of Richard Wagner /

1900-08.

PRINTED BY
TURNBULL AND SPEARS,
EDINBURGH

11280

ST. PUBLIC LIBRARY

PREFACE.

I HEREBY warn a small percentage of my critics—with the majority I have little fault to find of late—that any complaint about a whole volume being devoted to but two years might conceivably goad me into devoting the next to a bare six months. I do not want to punish the rest of my readers by such extreme reprisals, though insular bias might consider Wagner's only Philharmonic season the most exciting epoch in his life, just as it has lately gone into transports over the mere tidings of the discovery of a manuscript which can hardly prove of much intrinsic moment—his *Rule Britannia* overture. The London episode of 1855, little more than a waste of time to Wagner, was not particularly creditable to ourselves; accordingly I can scarcely regret that lack of space prevents my fulfilling a past intention of rounding off the present volume therewith; it will better comport with a less prominent position. Thus it is only incidentally that I have crossed the line dividing 1854 from 1855, and the said "two years" are, after all, scant measure; but it is not every year in the life even of a Wagner that offers so gigantic a subject as the poem, or half the composition, of DER RING DES NIBELUNGEN, and I trust the really gentle reader will not be too severe on me for having done my best to open up new glades therein. In other respects, moreover, I can remember no twelvemonth that has brought with it so large a mass of fresh biographic material, as that which has elapsed since publication of my volume iii. From North,

South, East and West, the most interesting details of Richard Wagner's life, inner as well as outer, have come in an almost continuous downpour, ending with his absolutely priceless letters to Mathilde Wesendonk, published but a month ago (in German, of course, though I have hopes of a speedy Englishing). From all which it will be easily understood that I feel bound at last to omit from my title-page Herr Glasenapp's name: it may relieve his mind to be freed of all responsibility for some of my conclusions and remarks; whilst I cannot honestly conceal the truth that very few of the ensuing pages are based, even for facts, on my esteemed precursor's work, accurate though that is. Later on, perhaps, we shall fall into line again, as I cannot imagine anything more authoritative, illuminating and exhaustive, than *his* recent fourth volume (dealing with the years 1864 to 1872); meanwhile I must content myself with hearty thanks for many a valuable reference and indication. Thanks also I owe, and gratefully do I tender, to two personal friends, the one of whom has helped by procuring me various modern foreign publications, the other by making ample extracts from more ancient ones: as Wagner himself once said, They know whom I mean.

WM. ASHTON ELLIS.

Horsted Keynes,
July 1904.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME IV.

PAGE

RICHARD WAGNER IN 1853 . . . . *Frontispiece*

I. "RING" EDITIONS AND REVISIONS. — *Der Ring des Nibelungen* privately printed, Feb. 1853.—Later editions; how and where they vary.—*Rheingold:* Erda's "All that is, endeth!"—Variants in *Die Walküre;* original Wotan-Fricka scene.—*Siegfried:* the lesson in Fear, and its alteration; 'strophic' test and the Wanderer-Mime scene.—*Siegfried's Tod:* newly-discovered fair copy of 1849; remarkable gloss at its end. The unrecovered 1850 replica; did it form the basis of an 1851 revision? Internal evidence of such revision in acts ii and iii of *Götterdämmerung.*—A drama that had grown . . . 3

II. THE GREAT POEM READ.—Reason why the *Ring* was printed privately. Its prefatory note. Distribution of copies.—Wagner reads it aloud at Zurich; protests against recital by others.—Opinions of its readers: Liszt, Stahr, Köhler, Schopenhauer, Keller. — Roeckel's objections replied to; a warning against 'inner meanings.'—Brynhild's farewell verses once again 67

III. FIRST WAGNER-FESTIVAL.—Wagner's portrait published. —Another change of abode; the "imp of luxury."—Second act of Berlin comedy.—Preliminaries of the three-day festival; financial guarantee; bandsmen and choir.—Poems of the three operas read aloud.—The concert-programme.—Festival and complimentary banquet.—Two epilogues: renewed warrant of arrest; torchlight serenade 94

IV. LISZT'S VISIT.—Attempts to gain leave to visit Germany; Duke of Coburg (his opera), Weimar and Dresden; frustrated.—"Solitude" at Zurich; Wagner at the pianoforte.—Longing for Liszt: incidents of his eight-day visit.—Niece

PAGE

Johanna.—St Moritz 'cure'; depression; Italy and insomnia.—Carlsruhe Festival: Eduard Devrient; Liszt the organiser; von Bülow reappears; Pohl's brochure.—Salutation at Basle; to Paris with Liszt.—Liszt replaced by Minna; back home again 118

V. Musician Again: *Das Rheingold.*—Incubation.—The music begun; deliberate harmonic simplicity; "plastic nature-motives."—"New method" of composing; *not* at the pfte.—Financial straits: first attempt to sell the *Lohengrin* performing-rights.—Composition resumed and concluded.—Leipzig fiasco of *Lohengrin;* foils second attempt to dispose of rights, and leads to renewed desire of amnesty.—Epistle to Roeckel.—Scoring *Rheingold;* more Panharmonic concerts; fresh phases in scoring.—Munich flirts with *Tannhäuser.*—Freedom of speech toward Liszt; another heart's-cry.—Score completed . 174

VI. —— Hollandaise.—Carolyszt again: the *Holländer* essay; a re-editress.—Pss Wittgenstein as predominant partner: forced analogy with Balzac; purple patches and poetic insight.—Wagner unenlightened as to the collaboration.—The Erik blot; psychology shallow and deep; a woman's intuition.—Wagner still left in the dark.—Liszt's true share in the essay.—A question of history; Weimar confusion of scores; "this *momentous* change" in close of overture.—The essay's influence 234

VII. A Berlin-Weimar Complication.—A frustrated concert-scheme; Dorn's *Nibelungen* at Weimar!—Renewal of negotiations for a Berlin *Tannhäuser:* friction between Hülsen and Liszt.—Brother Albert intervenes; makes matters worse.—Olive-branch from Hülsen; Liszt rejects it: Berlin-Weimar rupture.—Wagner's real need of Berlin.—Minna's journey; her interviews with Hülsen and King of Saxony; letter to the former.—Standstill for love of Liszt.—Hülsen's "last" offer; accepted by Wagner; pique and magnanimity.—A happy ending . . . 306

VIII. *Die Walküre* Composed.—Article on Gluck's *Iphigenia* overture.—*Walküre* music begun.—Sitten festival affair. A visitor from Cologne.—Composition resumed. Act i:

PAGE

a melody and a 'motive.' Musical Murrays.—Abortive scheme for concerts in Belgium and Holland: Weimar a little huffed.—A twofold liberation.—Act ii; Wotan's monologue; Fricka scene; musical 'reminiscences.'—Act iii: results of an analyst's misnomer.—The composition ended 360

APPENDIX.

SUPPLEMENTAL NOTES 421
INDEX 522

LIST OF MORE FREQUENT ABBREVIATIONS USED IN VOL. IV.

B. Bl., or *Bayr. Bl.*, stands for *Bayreuther Blätter.*

B. h. Ztgn	„	*Briefe hervorragenden Zeitgenossen an Franz Liszt—i.e.* "Letters of eminent Contemporaries" &c.
D. j. S.	„	*Der junge Siegfried.*
Gtdg	„	*Götterdämmerung.*
Holl.	„	*Der fliegende Holländer.*
Loh.	„	*Lohengrin.*
M. W.	„	*Musical World*, London.
N. Z.	„	*Neue Zeitschrift.*
P.	„	*Richard Wagner's Prose Works.*
Rh.	„	*Das Rheingold.*
S.	„	*Siegfried.*
S. Tod	„	*Siegfried's Tod.*
Tannh.	„	*Tannhäuser.*
W.-L.	„	Correspondence of Wagner and Liszt.
Wlk.	„	*Die Walküre.*

1853
TO
1855

Doch möcht' er den Ring sich errathen,
der macht' ihn zum Walter der Welt!

(SIEGFRIED, act ii.)

I.

"RING" EDITIONS AND REVISIONS.

Der Ring des Nibelungen *privately printed, Feb.* 1853.—*Later editions; how and where they vary.*—Rheingold: *Erda's "All that is, endeth!"—Variants in* Die Walküre; *original Wotan-Fricka scene.*—Siegfried: *the lesson in Fear, and its alteration; 'strophic' test and the Wanderer-Mime scene.*—Siegfried's Tod: *newly-discovered fair copy of* 1849; *remarkable gloss at its end. The unrecovered* 1850 *replica; did it form the basis of an* 1851 *revision? Internal evidence of such revision in acts ii and iii of* Götterdämmerung.—*A drama that had grown.*

Ihr Welten, endet euren Lauf!
Ew'ge Vernichtung, nimm mich auf!
DER FLIEGENDE HOLLÄNDER.

Nacht der Vernichtung neble herein!
SIEGFRIED.

WITH the ballad of the "Flying Dutchman" ringing in his head, and "Walhall's burning" on his lips, we left our lonely hero "staring at the lamp": a subject worthy of the greatest Symbolical painter, though stained glass alone could fully realise the values of the three varieties of light. Between the two unearthly visions the dull monotony of that prosaic lamp. Yet from out its vacuous shell what shapes are these that rise as from the wizard's crystal? "Pay good heed to my new poem—it comprises the world's beginning and end!"

A splutter, an ominous gurgle: with the helplessness of its old 'moderator' type, the lamp calls aloud for re-winding. Hé presto! the tone is changed. "My next job must be to write its music for the Frankfort and Leipzig Jews—it's the very thing for them!"

How is one to deal with a man who plays such pranks with one's emotions?—Nay, look closer, and you'll see 'tis no levity, but the irony of Wagner's whole position. The vastest drama

ever penned now lies before him, printer's black on paper-maker's white: will it ever see the light of other than mere reading lamps? Will its Rhinegold some day fall within the clutches of the modern Alberich?

Something similar must have passed through Wagner's mind while yearning for a death that certainly was "not to strike him on a sickbed" when he met it thirty long years hence, almost to the day. For it is on the 11th of February 1853 that he is writing, at the close of a letter accompanying the "poem of his life" on its way to friend Liszt. "Here you have a whole heap of new stuff of mine"—the letter begins—"My poem is finished, you see, and though not yet set to music, set up in printer's type; and all at my own expense, just for a few copies which I mean to bestow on my friends as a legacy in advance, lest I die in the midst of my work. Those who know how I am off, will think me most extravagant again, of course: be it so! The outer world behaves so shabbily towards me, that I haven't the least envy to copy it. So, with a certain quaking comfort—and secretly, not to be talked out of it—I have had this limited edition printed; and you're the first to whom I send a parcel."

With the author's objections to a public issue, at this stage of the work's existence, I will deal next chapter. For the moment it will suffice to quote from a letter to F. Heine which approximately dates the poem's preparation for the printer. Evidently writing on the last morning of 1852, Wagner says: "You know what an obstinate brute I am. Well, I have just finished my big Nibelungen poem, and mean to make a fair copy of the scrawl, so that my friends may share some sort of taste of it. That will take another full month, as I can devote no more than three hours a day to such a task at present. Finished it must be, however, before I proceed to anything else; otherwise I shall have no peace."

But a little way can the fair-copying have progressed—maybe to the end of *Rheingold*—when the poet was smitten by that staggering blow recorded at the close of last volume, the death of his chief epistolary confidant, unequalled Uhlig. The utter prostration caused by this "irreparable loss" would leave small energy for application of the final file, such as we may assume to have been contemplated in the original allowance of a "full month." Consequently, the remainder of the fair-copying would

become far more of a mechanical or automatic function, and we thus have yet another factor to account for occasional discrepancies still remaining in the "two Siegfrieds."

Though the last two sections of the *Ring* alone demand some critical elucidation, it will be more convenient to dispose once for all of the various editions of the entire poem, now that it has taken its earliest step beyond its author's study. For which reason I had better hang out a warning that this chapter is intended neither for the novice in the first flush of a fine hearing, nor for the High-priest who proclaims Wagnerian Drama a "revelation" too sacred to be accepted otherwise than with padlocked mouth. Long may the first preserve his youthful receptivity untroubled by searchings of the why and how! As for the second, we may pension him off with the reminder that Wagner himself implicitly submitted the poem of the *Ring des Nibelungen* to critical judgment apart from its music, when he issued it to "the reading public" in 1863 (*P.* III. 282-3), and once again in 1872 as part and parcel of his Collected Literary Works—*Gesammelte Schriften und Dichtungen* (*ibid.* 261, 263-4, 273). A work gradually added to, as I have shewn to be the case with this tetralogy, is not likely to be so unassailable in all its proportions and interconnections as the product of a single creative impulse, such as *Tristan und Isolde*. Here, accordingly, we have to be on our guard not so much against the moribund belittlers of Wagner's genius, as against those superior persons who would elevate into a shibboleth what is really nothing but a heedless excrescence or an overlooked survival, and who extort mysterious meaning from an obvious slip. The inner history of the poem, then—not its putative "inner meaning"—is what may profitably occupy the Wagner-biologist, after demonstration of its outer

To clear the ground, let us first come to an agreement as to what we shall accept as our standard 'text'—in the German, I mean. Perhaps it has never occurred to you, that, quite apart from the question of misprints, there may be a difficulty in determining which edition of the German RING is to be taken as the authoritative. Yet such a difficulty has to be faced; for the author himself set his seal on *two* several versions, by incorporating with his *Gesammelte Schriften* a text that differs in a thousand minutiæ from that embodied in the orchestral

score.* These two versions we may designate, without much fear of misapprehension, as the "classical" and the "acting" editions. By which of them are we to abide, when quoting a line that may present slightly different readings in the two?

Let that question bide a moment, since the list has to be swelled by two other versions which can hardly claim the author's imprimatur, yet are far more widely circulated than those just mentioned: I mean the "vocal," alias "complete pianoforte" score, and the so-called "textbook." By the nature of things, these are the more popular forms where expense or portability has to be considered. Will either of them serve our purpose? Not unreservedly, at present. The "vocal scores" are in process of revision, I believe, but meanwhile remain at partial variance alike with the "classical" and the "acting" edition.† The "textbooks" differ from all three, though a quite recent edition has made commendable efforts to approach perfection, and *very nearly* agrees with the words in the orchestral score.

Which of these four co-existent types shall we adopt for our criterion? As *Der Ring des Nibelungen* is no mere literary poem, not for a moment should we hesitate in pinning our faith to the "acting" version, i.e. to the text of the full score, published with the author's approval but a short while after the "classical" edition

---

* By then the vocal setting had been entirely completed, and the whole of the orchestration sketched out.—Anyone desirous of pursuing an exhaustive comparison of the 1872 edition with the score, will find in the *Bayr. Bl.* of 1897 a most carefully drawn up series of tables by Herr Max Zenker, covering twelve pages of double columns, and setting forth the variants of upwards of 840 different lines in the whole tetralogy. The majority of them, of course, are very slight, consisting of an added or elided "i" or "e," the transposition of a couple of words, and so on; others are distinct improvements in euphony or style.

† The latter part of this statement I make on Herr Zenker's authority (*loc. cit.*), but it should be qualified by the remark that, wherever I have consulted Klindworth's engraved vocal score of *Rheingold* (1861, in folio, or 'large 4°'), I have found it to be in agreement with the full score, save for two tiny exceptions:—a "Wort" where the full score has "Werk" (*cf.* old textbook p. 52, l. 8) and a "dir" where the full score erroneously has "du" (*ibid.* 59, l. 5). Variants in the vocal scores of the later members of the *Ring*, where not quite palpable misprints, may possibly be explained by the fact that, after *Rheingold*, Klindworth had to work from the "sketches," not from the finished orchestral manuscript (see Letter 213 in the Wagner-Liszt Correspondence, re *Die Walküre*).

of 1872.* In all quotations from the poem, therefore, I shall employ the words actually set to music in the orchestral score, unless specifically stated otherwise. But how if the reader should wish to consult the context, or should miss a point through absence of translation? In his best interest I might refer him to an admirable new edition provided with German, French and English words, in eleven volumes, coat-pocket size; yet, unless he be a professional musician, or quite an exceptional amateur, he is likely to feel somewhat at sea in an orchestral score, and may prefer to spend one-twentieth or one-fortieth of its cost upon a simple "textbook." So please don't be shocked if I select for this purpose, not the new almost-corrected textbook, which has yet to establish its title to permanence, but the old book of words that has done yeoman's service for a quarter of a century, and is to be found in the private library of wellnigh every opera-goer throughout the world. Its faults are thick upon it, but it has one great advantage, in that its *pagination* has never varied—not even when interleaved with what schoolboys would nickname a "crib"; moreover, I gather from the publishers of the RING that there is no immediate prospect of change in its German-English form. Wherefore, securing my quotations from the ultimate text itself on the enduring basis of the full score, I shall make all needful references to pages, and lines of pages, in terms of the old-accustomed "textbook" of 1876 and onward. It is not an ideal arrangement, but it is the only workable one, and, after all, will present no difficulty to the more advanced Wagnerian, even should this chapter be fortunate enough to meet his eye some half a century hence; for by then every line of the *Ring des Nibelungen* will be "as household words in his mouth," and the haply superannuated page-references as crutches to the sound of limb.

Having agreed on our criterion, we shall be able to work backward from it till we arrive at the main object of the present chapter, to wit, the aspect of the poem in its private issue of 1853.

As said, there are hundreds of minor variants, some of them quite infinitesimal, between the final form of the text, in the

* Unfortunately it is not the custom in the music-trade to date an issue; but Mr Dannreuther has informed us (*Grove's Dict.*) that the full scores of *Rheingold* and *Walküre* were first published in 1873, those of *Siegfried* and *Götterdämmerung* in 1876, whereas the earliest engraved vocal scores (Klindworth's original arrangement) were issued as follows, *Rh.* 1861, *W.* 1865, *S.* 1871, *G.* 1875—all, of course, by Schott & Co.

orchestral score, and its "classical" edition of 1872. But what does that 1872 edition represent? A verbatim reprint of its immediate predecessor, the first edition *published*, that of 1863; merely eight or nine altogether negligible amendments are to be found on comparing these two.* That really is very remarkable, seeing that the musical composition of virtually the last five acts of the tetralogy (counting the prologue to *Gtdg* as one act) had been taken in hand and finished meanwhile. On the other hand, the edition of '72 has a couple of paralipomena printed below the line, discarded passages thus rescued from oblivion: to these I shall return, simply noting for the present that nothing could more emphatically proclaim the literary monument. Save for its paralipomena, then, the intrinsic interest of the 1872 edition is shifted to its predecessor, and merely as a resuscitation of that bibliographic rarity, the 1863 edition, need it enter our reckoning.

Thus we have established the fact that in 1863, just ten years after its private issue, the poem of the *Ring des Nibelungen* was made over to "the reading public" in a form that differs as to countless minor details from the "acting" version. Were these variants confined to the latter part of the work, i.e. to those acts which had not as yet been crystallised in music, the explanation would be simple. Such is not the case, however: where deviation is greatest, namely in *Götterdämmerung*, it is no more than twice as great as in *Das Rheingold;* whereas the vocal score of *Rheingold* had actually been published two years before this first public issue of the entire poem. You suggest that Wagner may have made slight changes in his text *after* its musical composition, but prior to its publication in full score; changes perhaps introduced even while correcting the engraved plates of the latter? That, of course, is conceivable, and may account for a small proportion of the variants in the three dramas proper; but what are we to say to the vocal score of *Rheingold*, published early in 1861,† presenting numerous verses in a form that differs from the literary editions of '63 and '72, however slightly, yet is in absolute agreement with the orchestral score of '73 and onward? Take for instance Alberich's "entreisse dem Riff das

* I ought to observe that in the case of the 1863 edition I am entirely dependent on the evidence of Herr Zenker (see footnote to page 6).

† On the copy in the British Museum I find the official stamp with date of receipt "Apr. 11, 61."

Gold" (from his last speech in scene 1): here vocal and instrumental scores are in perfect accord, yet all three literary editions (the private issue of '53 and the two aforesaid) have "das Gold entreiss' ich dem Riff"—quite another rhythm. The music, you see, has varied here a matter of literary indifference; just as both scores distribute between Flosshilde and her two sisters, in equal portions, six lines beginning "Jetzt küsst sie sein Auge" (p. 14 textbook) which the three literary editions assign to Flosshilde alone. So purely musical a change might well be neglected in a poem printed apart from its music, but it is a little strange that the literary editions should adhere to the "von" of that much-debated "von einer kies'te mich keine" (*ibid.* 11), when even the vocal score had improved it into "bei." Still stranger are the next three examples. On page 24 of the textbook Fasolt has a speech of six lines, beginning "Was sagst du": its last three lines, "Die dein Speer birgt, sind sie dir Spiel, des berath'nen Bundes Runen?" are to be found in both scores, but have no equivalent in the three literary editions, where the little speech is reduced to half its length. Again, the last three lines of Donner's cloud-mustering (p. 72) are expanded by the music into five, but the literary editions ignore alike the added and the altered words. Page 27, on the other hand, gives Donner two lines, "schuldig blieb' ich Schächern nie," which the literary editions alone present.

In the foregoing paragraph I have purposely restricted myself to *Das Rheingold*, since it is the only member of the RING whose musical setting was made public prior to the toneless poem. There can be very little doubt that wellnigh all the variants in *Die Walküre* and the first two acts of *Siegfried* were also effected in the process of musical composition, *i.e.* some years *before* this '63 edition; but, without an opportunity of consulting the original autographs, I prefer to abide by a certainty. And that certainty is confirmed by the fact that the acts not composed until *after* 1863 are reproduced in this first public edition exactly as they stood in the private issue of 1853, save that the titles *Siegfried* and *Götterdämmerung* take the place of "Der junge Siegfried" and "Siegfried's Tod."*

This 1863 edition, accordingly, can by no means be assigned

* Taking the '72 edition as a replica of that of '63, some three to four tiny divergences are all that I can discover between the '63 and the '53 versions of these acts, *e.g.* "gemächlicher" substituted for the obsolete "mäliger"

significance in the inner history of the poem, however interesting as a biographic document. To take its precise range, we must try to realise Wagner's position that Spring. Utterly disheartened by more than three years wasted on the Paris *Tannhäuser* fiasco and the Vienna non-representation of *Tristan*, he had abandoned all present intention of completing the music for the RING, as he nowhere saw one ray of hope that the conditions for the production of so gigantic a drama would ever be attained. He therefore gave the poem to the world as more or less a caput mortuum. On what principle he edited it, what copy he followed, it is impossible to say. Certainly he observed the more important, together with a number of the trifling changes already made in the original text during composition of the music; but he cannot have checked it line by line. Why should he? There would be time enough for that when his drama should enter actual life, when its characters trod the boards. And nine years later, it must be remembered, the republication of the *Ring* poem was no separate undertaking, but an integral factor in the republication of *all*, or almost all its author's literary works. With very few exceptions, the component parts of the *Gesammelte Schriften* were republished exactly as they had originally appeared. Considering that nine volumes, averaging nearly 400 pages each, were thus reprinted in the brief space of two years—from the middle of 1871 to the middle of 1873—and that the same period was occupied by the most strenuous activity in completing the orchestral score of the RING and building its theatre, we can easily understand that there would be little time to spare for a pedantic reconstitution of its text. The 1863 edition was evidently handed to the printer, just as it stood, for reproduction in vols. v and vi of the *Ges. Schr.* 1872. When all is said, neither the one nor the other was meant for a prompt-book.

Now that we have learnt how they represent neither the beginning nor the end of the journey, but a sort of indeterminate half-way house, there can be no object in wearying the English reader with a catalogue of the variants as between the twin '63='72 editions of the RING text and the full score on the one hand, the '53 edition on the other. To the latter, the original

(*Gtdg* 19), and "Blitzend Gewölk" (ibid. 34) for "*Blitz und Gewölk.*" In the latter instance the score, indeed, seems to have relapsed to an obvious misprint of the '53 edition, though the '63 and '72 had corrected it.

private issue, we may at once proceed, as a subject of far greater interest, from whatever point of view. But even here I have no intention of going into more minutiæ than necessary, since the great majority of the textual alterations occasioned by the musical setting may be described as indifferentia: they transpose a word or two, elide a syllable, or subtilise a shade of style, without in the least affecting the sense. Some day it is to be hoped that an historical edition will reproduce in parallel columns the first and final readings, with possibly a marginal indication of all Wagner's preliminary or other sketches connected therewith; but that would rather be for the benefit of the native German, than of the foreigner. My task must be far simpler; at anyrate until I reach the more complex problems presented by "the two Siegfrieds."

Das Rheingold, the latest-written of the four members of the Ring-poem, was the first to be set to music; and, as the score received its last touch only two years from the penning of the first line of its text, naturally we should not expect substantial variation in the latter. I have already noticed five or six of the altered readings; the rest, though numbering considerably over a hundred, are really of such trifling moment as not to call for mention, with three exceptions. In two of these the Hoard itself comes into question: the second of them, where "ganz schwand uns der Hort" now takes the place of "ganz schwand uns das Gold" (p. 66 textbook), may or may not have significance; but the first, where Alberich now gives his gruesome "blessing" to the "Ring," instead of to the "Hort" (61 *ibid.*), is obviously an emendation of some weight.

Our third exception, occurring at the end of Erda's long speech, demands more thought. Here the original reading, "Ein düsterer Tag dämmert den Göttern: in Schmach doch endet dein edles Geschlecht, lässt du den Reif nicht los" ("For the Gods a day of gloom is dawning: but in shame shall end thy noble race, giv'st thou not up the ring"), is replaced in the musical setting, and all subsequent versions, by "Alles, was ist, endet. Ein düsterer Tag dämmert den Göttern: dir rath' ich, meide den Ring!" ("All that is, endeth. For the Gods there dawns a day of gloom: I counsel thee, quit the ring!"). Now, there is a perfectly simple explanation to be found for the change, and one that could not have escaped the student, had he not been brought

up for the last ten years on a brain-racking letter written to Roeckel just after the change was effected.* That letter, through *seeming* to offer an explicit commentary on this particular passage, has thrown a number of well-meaning explorers off the scent; and I must confess that it was only after worrying at the supposed commentary till it drove me to the forlorn resolve to have nothing more to do with it, that I suddenly discovered its own initial lack of bearing on the point.

Let us see how Wagner puts it, at the mathematic centre of a private missive of 26 pages that took him two whole mornings to write (dated "Jan. 25, 1854," at its commencement, "Jan. 26" at its end). "To myself my Nibelungen-poem has but the following sense: representation of the Reality defined by me above.—*Statt der Worte: 'ein düstrer Tag dämmert den Göttern: in Schmach doch endet Dein edles Geschlecht, lässt Du den Reif nicht los!' lasse ich jetzt Erda nur sagen, 'Alles was ist—endet: ein düstrer Tag dämmert den Göttern: Dir rath' ich, meide den Ring!'* —We must learn to *die*, and to *die* in the completest sense of the word; dread of the End is the fount of all lovelessness, and arises there alone where Love already pales. How came it that this highest benedictrix of all living things so vanished from the human race that its every action, every institution, became prompted at last by nothing but fear of the end? My poem shews it. It shews Nature in her undistorted truth, with all her opposing elements . . . Alberich and his ring could have done no harm to the Gods, had they not been already susceptible to the mischief;" and so on, with a discussion of the loveless relations between Wotan and Fricka, but not another word concerning Erda in all the letter, before or after.

In the above I have purposely left a whole sentence untranslated, and beg the reader to obliterate it for a moment. He will then see that the commentary "We must learn to *die*" etc. follows quite naturally on that reference to the "reality defined above," i.e. to an earlier part of the same letter, where we read: "to ascend into the fullest truth, is to yield oneself as sentient human being to complete reality: to drink to its dregs the brimmed cup

* I say "just after," because we know from a letter to Liszt of Jan 15, 54, that the musical composition of *Rheingold* was finished the middle of that month, whilst the Erda scene occurs almost at the end of the work. Other points in this letter must come up for discussion later.

of birth, of growth, of culmination—drooping and decay; to will to live one's full of joy and grief—and die" (very slightly paraphrased from pp. 26-7 of the German ed.). On the other hand, much later in the letter we find that Roeckel has "chiefly astonished" Wagner by a question as to "why the Gods should perish, after all, now the gold is returned to the Rhine?" Precisely the type of objection we should expect from a merely political mind; and among the "critical remarks" wherewith Roeckel had demoralised "five sheets" of guiltless paper, four months since, we may reasonably infer that exception was also taken to the fact of Wotan's not really escaping his fate when he parted with the ring at Erda's bidding. Wagner might have replied that she did not suggest that its surrender would avert "the ending" of the gods, but simply their ending "in *shame*." However, undaunted Roeckel could trip him up again, with the awkward reminder that Wotan in *Die Walküre* still talks of "fear of a shameful end" as nursed in him by the Wala for many a year thereafter. So Erda's original *Rheingold* formula had really better be replaced by something less open to cavil, an oracular utterance loosely coupled with a serious admonition, instead of a contingent threat that might be interpreted as a promise if complied with.

That, I am confident, is the plain history of the much-debated change. And now we can easily dispose of the sentence I left untranslated; a sentence which, from its demarcation by dashes, I strongly suspect of figuring in the original letter as a marginal note or something similar.* In any case, Wagner has just launched on an abstruse exegesis of the "meaning" of his *entire* drama, when, remembering that his correspondent is not yet apprised of a slight change in its diction,† he *interrupts* himself with a "By the way: instead of A, I make Erda now merely say B." The "*nur sagen*," or "*merely* say," ought to be quite

* Analogously, I suspect that the sentence preceding it should read, "Für mich hat mein Gedicht nur folgenden Sinn: Darstellung der oben von mir bezeichneten Wirklichkeit.—" in the same manner as I have punctuated its translation two paragraphs back; i.e. that it is by a mere transcriber's or printer's error that we find the word "Darstellung" starting an entirely fresh paragraph, and by an unfortunate coincidence, a fresh page to boot. Did the Germans not use capitals for all their nouns, wherever situate, the confusion might have never arisen.

† The *only* change of any importance, at this date, unless we attach a certain weight to Fasolt's allusion to the runes on the spear (p. 9 *ant.*).

sufficient to divest the sentence of any but the most casual connection with the didactics that follow it.

Perhaps it may be thought that I have paid more attention to the point than it warrants. But I feel sure that a misapprehension, or misapplication, of this passage in Wagner's letter to Roeckel has led to a false conception of Erda's function in the drama. Had its context any specific reference to the change aforesaid, it would imply that she was endeavouring to *remove* from Wotan all "fear of the end" by representing that an end must come to all things, and he had best conform his conduct to that philosophic maxim. On the contrary, it is *she* who robs him of his pristine insouciance ("da verlor ich den leichten Muth," *Wlk.* act ii) by inspiring him with a fear he had never experienced before: her last words to him, in this same scene, are still "Brood on it in fear and dread"; and so new to him is the suggestion, that he replies, "shall I fear, I first must learn all." Had his nature been lightly moved to quail, he would never have shrugged his shoulders at Alberich's curse; and his reproach to Erda in act iii of *Siegfried* is, that it was *she* who had scared him into "dread of a shameful end." Only by realising that this was the object of her voluntary appearance in *Rheingold*, can we gauge the dramatic import of her conjuration by Wotan in *Siegfried*, where she is forced to rise against her will to hear the death-knell on "Grandmother-wisdom, grandmother-dread!" Brooding in elemental darkness, her knowledge is limited to proverbs and mysterious hints, gruesome forebodings without prevision of a cure. As for her interference in respect of the ring, it was but grandmotherly-wise in its obstinate refusal to admit its semi-ignorance: whole wisdom would have done more than merely counsel the god to "*quit* the ring"; it would have admonished him that Loge's mocking plea for the Rhine-daughters was the only counsel to be taken seriously, to be followed as a pure matter of impersonal justice, let the consequences be what they might.—So much for Erda: if you wish to regard her symbolically, you may call her "the *fear* of the Lord that is the *beginning* of wisdom"—by no means its end; but her character and office remain unaffected by the changed wording of her oracular utterance.

Nevertheless, the substitution of "All that is, endeth," for the earlier contingent threat, is the outcome of a true artistic instinct. To say nothing of its being far better poetry, to have dropped the

flattery of "thy noble race," the change adds immensely to our conception of Wotan's character. These "noble" gods had hitherto fancied themselves cut out for immortality, with a prescriptive right to disdain whatever breed they deemed inferior; when Alberich threatened a future defeat of the gods by his infernal legions, the dwarfs with whom the gods had never stooped to make a compact, Wotan had treated it as rank blasphemy ("Vergeh', frevelnder Gauch!"), just as blue-blood Fricka hereafter speaks with withering scorn of "vulgar mortals" ("gemeiner Menschen," *W.* 30). A mere repetition of Alberich's personal, or racial menace might have had but little influence on a ruler so proudly convinced of his superiority; but when this eerie sibyl, with a solemnity enhanced by all the mystery of the unexpected, reveals to him her only piece of positive knowledge, the one great lesson of the past, the effect on Wotan is instantaneous, marking him at once as of finer metal than the other Asen: "Geheimniss-hehr hallt mir dein Wort." To him it presents an entirely novel, a far more serious outlook on the world. Not as yet does he fully grasp it, but his quick imagination is so impressed that, forgetting his instant peril, forgetting the ring, the burg, the giants, and above all his frowning wife—whose jealousy mounts guard at once—he fain would plunge into earth's arcana to "learn more." The other gods, much duller of perception, hear nothing but the personal injunction "Quit the ring"; but to Wotan, who has just been bartering his freedom of action for a supposedly eternal citadel, that "All that is—endeth" forms a crisis in his inner life. Not until Fricka has coaxed him from his brown study, and Donner has swept away the clouds, and Froh flung the rainbow-bridge of hope toward ill-bought Walhall—his old associates wooing him back awhile to their short-sighted views—does he throttle his awe, and defiantly make the best of a bad bargain by evolving his "hero" illusion.

In *Die Walküre*, passing by a number of insignificant transpositions etc., and even such undoubted small improvements as "von Hetze und Harst" for the original "von wilder Hetze" (p. 11), the first change that need arrest us is that in Siegmund's song of Spring and Love. Here the lyrical flow of the music is accountable for the expansion of three verses, "in linden Lüften wiegt sich der Lenz; über Wald und Auen," into the well-known

seven, "in mildem Lichte leuchtet der Lenz; auf linden Lüften leicht und lieblich, Wunder webend er sich wiegt; durch Wald und Auen"; whilst, three lines lower, the more sentimental "lächelt" of '53 is replaced by "lacht" (*lacht sein Aug'*)—"laughter" being far more appropriate than "smiles," alike to Spring, to the "eye," and to the vocabulary of a forest-bred Siegmund. Similarly, Sieglinde having already spoken of the "glow" of Siegmund's glance ("Deines Auges Gluth erglänzte mir schon," p. 23), it simply weakened the image to follow it with "sparks of fire," as in the '53 edition; so "des Feuer's Sprühen sprach schon zu mir" is discarded thenceforward.—This same speech of Sieglinde's ends with a question whether "Wehwalt," i.e., "Woe-begone," be in truth her lover's name. In all the literary editions he replies, "Nicht heiss' ich so seit du mich liebst"; well rendered by Mr Forman, "No longer, since thy love I learned." Both scores, however, have the palpable misreading "Nicht heiss' *m*ich so" etc., reflected in the English version that now accompanies the full score, "Ne'er call me so, since thou art mine"; which destroys the meaning altogether. This is one of the extremely rare instances of an uncorrected error in the orchestral score; and that it *is* an error, is proved by Wagner's having changed the original "Heisse mich du" of Siegmund's next speech into "*Nenne* mich du (wie du liebst dass ich dich heisse)."

In this closing scene of act i there are one or two other minute changes, all tending to an improvement of euphony or rhythm, consequently of style. Thus the question of Sieglinde's that comes between the last two quotations is altered from "Und Friedmund, sagtest du, dürftest nicht froh du dich nennen?" into "Und Friedmund darfst du froh dich nicht nennen?" whilst Siegmund's "wie dir, o Herrliche, hehr es blickt," becomes "wie, Herrliche, hehr dir es strahlt." More extensive is the alteration in the words sung by Siegmund as he seizes the sword. Where we now have "Heiligster Minne . . . drängt zu That und Tod" (p. 25), the original poem ran as under:—

Heiligster Liebe
höchste Noth
brennt mir hell in der Brust:
schmachvoller Bande
schmählichste Noth
hält in Fesseln uns fest.

Here, as von Wolzogen shrewdly remarks,* the application of a musical motive from *Rheingold* has transformed two balanced strophes into one rushing climax. Indisputably the lines gain much in vigour, though we are thereby robbed of Siegmund's characterisation of Sieglinde's *bondage*, i.e. to Hunding, as shameful and degrading. Per contra, the "drängt zu That und Tod" of the second version adds a tragic note that we shall find recurring in the second version of Tannhäuser's scene with Venus, "Mein Sehnen drängt zum Kampfe . . . mich drängt es hin zum Tod"; a coincidence to be explained by the fact that the author had been steeping himself in *Die Walküre*, with Klindworth at the pianoforte, just before he revised his *Tannhäuser* for Paris (1860).

Act ii of *Die Walküre*. Neglecting the scene between Wotan and Fricka for the moment, in that between Wotan and Brynhild we find a few insignificant variants, on none of which need we dwell save that affecting the third line from the foot of p. 37 (old textbook), "von mir doch barg sie ein Pfand." Originally it ran, "von mir doch empfing sie ein Kind"; a statement difficult to reconcile with the "acht Schwestern" of a line or two later. The point appears to have puzzled Schopenhauer, since he makes a mark against the seemingly conflicting passages in his copy of the Ring-poem. Doubtless it also worried one or other of Wagner's private friends, for he has slurred the line into the form already-cited by the time the vocal score is published. Curiously enough, though the '63 and '72 editions here agree with the vocal score, the full score reverts for its verb to the original form, reading "von mir doch empfing sie ein Pfand." It is a very small matter in itself; but, involving the addition of a musical note to the voice-part, it suggests not only that there may have been an occasional slight discrepancy between the text supplied to Klindworth in the composition-draft (on which to base his pianoforte arrangement) and that incorporated with the full orchestral score, but also that the vocal score was the one consulted for the first public edition of the poem.

Again passing by a number of infinitesimal variants, we arrive at the scene between Brynhild and Siegmund. Here the musical

* In course of an exhaustive comparison of the '53 and '63 editions of the *Ring* poem, contributed to the *Bayreuther Blätter* 1896; see Appendix to the present volume, page 424.

theme has itself dictated the compression of the original "Grüsst mich froh eine Frau in Walhall's Räumen?" into the far nobler "Grüsst mich in Walhall froh eine Frau?" (p. 49). The same cause has pruned the "süss" from "umfängt Siegmund süss Sieglinde dort?" (*ibid.*). Finally the musician has bidden the poet drop three lines, where Siegmund draws his sword to take "two lives at one stroke": the '53 poem had followed up the numerical train with "Das dritte Leben, dem Wodan droht—werthlos werf' ich's ihm hin!" ("the third life, that Wodan threatens—worthless I fling at his feet!").

Act iii. Here, apart from the suppression of a '53 "Rasch zu Ross—das rath' ich euch," after the "meidet den Felsen!" in Wotan's dismissal of the troop of Valkyries (p. 74), there really is no change worth mentioning beyond a slight redistribution of the lines sung by individual members of that troop; little changes of cast, so to speak, attributed by Wolzogen to a wish to give Waltraute a shade more prominence, in view of the rôle she will play in *Götterdämmerung*. On this assumption—quite a reasonable one—we may argue that the Waltraute scene in the work last-named had not presented itself to its author's mind by the time he wrote *Die Walküre*.

One omission subsequent to the 1853 issue I have reserved till now, because it is more or less a corollary to the change that swept away a block of about 100 lines before the poem was printed even privately. The text-book and scores end Fricka's second speech in act ii with "das kühn den Gatten gekränkt"; all three literary editions, on the contrary, continue it with "Von dir nun heisch' ich harte Büsse an Sieglinde und Siegmund" ("From thee I therefore claim stern penalty on Sieglinde and Siegmund"). Though the musical setting has rejected these three lines as superfluous, they are of some interest through their reversing the natural and usual sequence "Siegmund und Sieglinde": the goddess's vengeance thus appears to be aimed against her own sex in the first place, just as it is the breaking of the bonds of an iniquitous wedlock that stands in the forefront of her indictment. It was as well to drop the lines, however; they might have led the average hearer to await some more direct punishment of Sieglinde than that of being left defenceless through her brother's death.

Separated from the above by but six verses for Wotan, the classical edition of 1872 gives us the first of those 'paralipomena'

to which I have already alluded.* Here we are out of the undergrowth of minor differences, for this is a passage of such moment that nothing but the sternest artistic necessity can have impelled the poet to discard it from his artwork. In *Ges. Schr.* vol. vi. he has it printed below the main text of pages 37 to 42, so that its 127 verses are made supplementary to the 37 which begin with Fricka's "Wie thörig und taub du dich stell'st" and end with Wotan's "Siegmund's und Sieglinde's Bund" (cf. text-book 28-29). The first and last lines are respectively the same in both readings, and in fact 34 out of the 37 in the upper version have their facsimile in the lower, save for quite negligible variants in four of them. In round numbers, then, it is a matter of ninety lines rescued by their author from oblivion. They are prefaced with the following laconic note: "I here supply the original wording of this scene, as drafted before the music was composed."

That introductory note is provokingly reticent, since the 1853 edition of the poem, printed nearly *two years before* the music was written, gives precisely the same reading of this passage as the upper one in *Ges. Schr.* (and as the '63 edition and both scores, for that matter) with exception of one unimportant word, "den hart verletzten" *vice* "den hart gekränkten." Nevertheless, Wagner calls the lower version the "original wording," and his statement is corroborated by the plain fact that the upper consists of nothing but excerpts from the lower, with the solitary exception of three neutral lines, "Dass jene sich lieben, leuchtet dir hell: drum höre redlichen Rath"; lines which bear their nature on their face, a mere flying bridge to span a gap. The abbreviation, consequently, must have been undertaken either in the act of fair-copying, or during revision of the '53 proofs.

Why the scene was altered, is quite another question. It can have been on account neither of its matter nor of its style, else the poet would scarcely have resurrected it in his standard edition.

---

* The other two occur at the end of *Götterdämmerung*. It is scarcely right to class them together, however, since the lines "Ihr, blühenden Lebens" etc. figure in all the literary editions, though not in the score; whereas the Schopenhauerian "Führ' ich nun nicht mehr &c.' are given solely in the classical edition of 1872—see Mr Alfred Forman's translation of the RING. Yet a third alternative reading of this farewell address, likewise abandoned, is reproduced in the *Bayr. Blätter* 1893—see next chapter.

The objection must have lain in its length, and more particularly in the equality of its length with that of the still more important scene that follows it. With a true artist's eye for proportion, Wagner thus sacrificed a full third of his original Wotan-Fricka scene, to throw into greater relief what is virtually Wotan's monologue in its successor. But he thereby deprived us of not inessential enlightenment as to the action of the god and goddess since we saw them last in *Rheingold;* wherefore he invites the reader behind the scenes, so to speak, in an entr'acte.

For a poetic rendering of this supplement I must refer the reader to the English translation of the RING by Mr Alfred Forman, the other translators having absolutely ignored it. Its substance, however, adds so much to our knowledge of that mysterious "idea" of Wotan's ("Der Gedanke, den ich nie nennen durfte," *S.* iii), that I will endeavour to reproduce it as nearly literally as possible :—

Fricka. Thou feignest not to know what crime it is that wounds my heart!

Wotan. Thou seest but the one thing; from my sight it is chased by the other that I see.

Fricka. The 'one thing' I see, is a breach of wedlock's sacred oath, a blow to me its guardian.

Wotan. Thou call'st that wedlock, which is but violence done to love? Light in thy scales weighs woman, when thou hallowest the outrage of a Hunding's suit!

Fricka. If brute violence lays the world in waste, whose blame is it save Wotan's? The weak thou ne'er shield'st, the strong thou abettest; rapine, and murder, and raging of men, are *thy* mad work. Mine 'tis, that something be saved where all's lost, held holy still midst the fury of change. Where the turbulent thirsts at last for rest, where the sweets of possession may tame the rough mind, the rent coil I re-knit into orderly wont. Thy hand thou ne'er raisedst against Hunding's offence: too weak was *I* to fend it; but since by sacred oaths he purged it, Fricka forgives, and shields the right they gained him. Didst *thou* not speed his passion, then spoil not thou my calm!

Wotan. When have I thwarted thy dealings? Bind thou what never will fit; trump peace and oaths that lie of love. But ask not that I weld amain what will not hold for thy patching; wherever live forces are jarring, to battle I open the way.

[The last sentence is common to both versions, as also are Fricka's next speech and Wotan's reply, where, completely worsted in her first line of

argument, she changes it for that of horror at a coupling "never known before," and he bids her add to her harvest of facts "a thing that has fitted itself." Then the older version continues:—]

Fricka. Is ribald mockery thine answer to my burning shame? Thou laugh'st to scorn the worth thyself confer'dst upon thy wife. Whither art rushing, headlong god? To ruin wouldst thou hurl a universe that had its laws from thee?

Wotan. Fore all I wield the law primordial: where forces are wheeling their way to fresh birth, my circle I trace; whither 'tis heading, I guide the stream; the fount whence it flows I guard: on strength of thew, and strength in love, the right to live have I aye bestowed. That right the twins have stormed: Minne nursed them in the mother's womb; unbeknown lay they there, unbeknown have they now loved. Wouldst gladden thyself with thy blessing, on Siegmund and Sieglinde's bond, then, shed its grace!

[At this point we come back to the upper, or ordinary version, in which I would just note that the "so seg'ne mit göttlich heiliger Gunst" of the lower has become "so segne, lachend der Liebe," since these last three words—immediately preceding "Siegmund's und Sieglinde's Bund"—may afford us a clue to the end of the 3rd act of *Siegfried*, cf 438 *inf.*]

After reading the above, I think you will agree that nothing but consideration for dramatic balance can have induced the poet to cut down his original conception of the scene, and that he has greatly aided our insight into his characters by restoring it for literary purposes. Even Hunding stands out sharper from the canvas, now that we know a little of his antecedents, and we can better appreciate the contemptuous "Go kneel to Fricka" wherewith the god snuffs his life out at end of the act. But the chief gain is to our knowledge of Wotan himself, and of his relations with Fricka on the one hand, the twins on the other.

In Wotan's first brief reply to his spouse, "Du siehst nur das Eine; das And're seh' ich, das Jenes mir jagt aus dem Blick," we have a parallel to Brynhild's lines in act iii concerning the "Zwiespalt, der dich zwang, diess Eine ganz zu vergessen. Das And're musstest einzig du seh'n" etc., and "ich sah nun Das nur, was du nicht sah'st" (*W.* 76-77). Setting the two passages together, we begin to understand why Wotan is represented as having parted with one of his eyes when he won Fricka to wife (*Rh.* 22). However much he may strive to keep one aim alone in sight, that other eye in Fricka's guardianship will re-assert its

claim, and assert it in such a way that *reflection* interferes with *will*. It was the earliest of all the "pacts" he made—cf. the Norns' scene, where the idea is merely given another form *—and with it began his inner conflict. One-eyed, in any save a physical sense, the god is not; but one eye is directed inwards, and Wotan always ends by seeing more than any of the other characters in the drama, for he is the only one of them ever to admit having been in the wrong. Neither Fricka nor Brynhild—each of whom has a pair of eyes that sees but one thing at a time—can follow this paradox of a truly double vision.

That brings us to what I have called the mystery of "Wotan's Gedanke." Neither Fricka nor Brynhild has grasped it; both of them interpret it as more or less a piece of personal favouritism. The "original wording" of this scene shews it quite plainly as a gigantic experiment in Evolution, of which the heroes brought to Walhall are mere by-products. Through one of those flashes that come to genius half-unconsciously, Wotan (i.e. Wagner) has anticipated the Darwinian theory of the Struggle for Existence leading to the Survival of the Fittest, as may be seen in his final answer to Fricka's reproach that he is perpetually stirring up strife and abetting the strong, where he sums up his activity in the words: "Des Urgesetzes walt' ich vor Allem: wo Kräfte zeugen und kreisen, da zieh' ich meines Wirkens Kreis . . . wo Leibes- und Liebeskraft, da wahrt' ich mir Lebensmacht." Here he identifies himself with the "primordial law" of Natural Selection that had *thitherto* engendered life. But, to crown his great experiment, to free the world from the bonds that bind it, he wants "the other" whereof he speaks to Brynhild, "*der nicht mehr ich, und aus sich wirkte was ich nur will*" (p. 40), he wants Spontaneous Generation; † wherefore he deludes himself into the belief that the twins

---

* The explanation given by the Wanderer in *Siegfried* act iii (p. 81), on the other hand, I hold to be of earlier origin, as it confuses the issue. Not that much harm is done thereby; for the "one-eyedness" is a feature of the ancient myths, and may be interpreted in different fashions.

† Since the above was written (early 1903) we have had the revolutionary discovery of radium and the changing of its "emanation" into another element, helium, bringing into prominence the but slightly earlier discoveries of "electrons" and radio-activity. Now listen to a few sentences from Sir Oliver Lodge's lecture on "Radium and its meaning," delivered at Birmingham Jan. 6 of this year (1904):—"An atom of matter, as near as we can estimate it at present, consists of positive and negative electrons—the negative electrons

had *forced* their right to life in his despite: "Das Zwillingspaar *zwang* meine Macht." * In support of this assertion, he virtually denies his fathership, and claims for *Siegmund and Sieglinde* a species of origin by parthenogenesis: "Minne nährt' es im Mutterschooss," Love itself had "fed them in their mother's womb," where they "lay unbeknown" to him. Minds like those of Fricka and Alberich might look on the twins as his children, if they chose; but Brynhild, the repository of all his other secrets, he has always taught to regard them as an entirely independent order of creation; and that view he now endeavours to instil into Fricka—with little prospect of success, in the circumstances.

Whether we affiliate them to him or not, to him the simultaneous birth of Siegmund *and* Sieglinde was in itself a miracle,

---

in a state of violent movement, with occasional possibility of escape. . . The spontaneous breaking up of an atom constitutes a novel source of energy, larger than any previously known . . . only a very few atoms are unstable from instant to instant . . . but they are probably none of them really and eternally permanent. . . The most important consequence is the discovery of the mutability of matter, the transmutation of elements. In old days Heraclitus promulgated the doctrine that the universe was not a 'being,' but a 'becoming'; that everything was in a state of flux—*πάντα ῥεῖ*—nothing stationary or fixed or permanent. It is absolutely true. . . Birth, culmination and decay, is the rule, whether for a plant or an animal, a nation or a planet or a sun. Twenty years ago it was thought that the atoms of matter were exempt from this liability to change. . . Not so; the process of change has now been found to reach to these also. Nothing material is permanent. . . The atoms are crumbling and decaying: must they not also be forming and coming to the birth? This last we do not know as yet. It is the next thing to be looked for. Decay only, without birth and culmination, cannot be the last word. The discovery may not come in our time, but science is rapidly growing, and it may. Science is still in its early infancy. We are beginning to comprehend a few of the secrets of Nature; we are yearly coming nearer to some sort of comprehension of the mind and method infused into the material cosmos."—In light of this scientific revelation, con once more those lines about the *Urgesetz* or "law primordial," whereby "forces are *wheeling* to birth," and answer if the Poet be not, as Carlyle said, a Seer too!

* Here "Macht," of course, is nothing but an abbreviation of the "Lebensmacht" that ends the previous sentence. That "Das Zwillingspaar" *governs* the verb, is not only to be inferred from the stabreim, but is positively proved by the '53 edition of *Siegfried*, where Mime spoke of "ein viel-zwingendes Zwillingspaar" in lieu of the present "ein wild-verzweifeltes Zwillingspaar"; whilst the construction which I place on "unbewusst," namely "unknown *to me*," is borne out by the use made of the same word in further course of this act ii of *Die Walküre*, "fremd dem Gott, frei seiner Gunst, unbewusst, ohne Geheiss" (*W.* 39-40).

an *excess* of Nature's, just as popular superstition attaches magic properties to the double kernel of a nut, and so on, even to this day. And the mystery of their birth is matched by his "deeply mysterious relation to their fatal love" (see letter of Nov. 51 to Liszt), here expressed by "unbewusst lag es einst dort, unbewusst liebt' es sich jetzt." However erroneous it soon is proved to him by Fricka's ruthless logic, his assumption had been that Siegmund himself—not a possible derivative of Siegmund's—was the "free hero" he needed; and Siegmund he therefore had led to where the magic sword awaited him. Even Fricka, who by no means stints her indictments, goes no farther than that in her reference to what we may call the background of act i: though he has roused her utmost wrath by invoking her blessing on the union as a *fait accompli*, she never accuses Wotan of having incited it; "unbeknown" she tacitly allows *that* to have been, and from its very rebellion against divine guidance she deduces a downfall of the gods, should it not be condignly punished.

The opposition between Fricka and Wotan consists in his regarding as the strongest token of that revolutionary independence, required for his scheme of liberation, what she regards as criminal insubordination. Fricka wins the day in that part of the scene with which we are familiar, not by convicting Wotan of having instigated one particular offence, but by convincing him that his whole design of moulding the "free hero" is based on a rotten foundation, since the free hero, if such there ever could be, must mould himself. "Selbst muss der Freie sich schaffen," Wotan admits to himself thereafter; and here Fricka clinches her argument with "Mit Unfreien streitet kein Edler. . . Siegmund verfiel mir als Knecht" (p. 33). The process of that Pyrrhic victory of Fricka's is made much clearer to us, now that this restoration of the scene to its pristine integrity has shewn the internecine warfare that had prevailed between Wotan's inner and outer eye for ages past. Not till both eyes are voluntarily closed to schemes of world-perpetuation, will he find rest.

We arrive at "the two Siegfrieds," about which, as foreshadowed toward the end of last volume, there will be a great deal more to say. Without further preliminaries, then—save an earnest request that you will get your textbooks out to follow me—I lead you straight to the middle of act i of *Siegfried* proper,

where the 1853 edition has something quite extraordinary to shew.

Down to Mime's production of the broken pieces of the sword, and the fifth verse of Siegfried's rejoinder, "mühe dich rasch" (text-book p. 18), the scene had proceeded on the lines with which we are all familiar; but in this first edition the remainder of Siegfried's speech is represented merely by the words "dass ich heut' noch die Waffe gewinn'!" In itself that makes no great difference, as we shall find the substance of the 14 missing verses in another place; but it is a harbinger of more radical variation. —Mime's next question, "Was willst du noch heut mit dem Schwert?" and Siegfried's answer, "Aus dem Wald fort" etc., stand word for word the same as to-day, and are followed by the lad's impetuous dash into the forest, leaving Mime "in utmost alarm." Presumably Mime's alarm is prompted chiefly by the boy's last words, "dich, Mime, nie wieder zu seh'n," as if in the excitement of the moment the dwarf had forgotten that Siegfried *must* return, to fetch his sword; for both versions give Mime the same cry "Halte! halte! wohin?" But the 1853 edition went much farther than mere passing terror lest the lad should have given him the slip: it actually made Mime lure him back for a continuation of the scene, and a continuation that added to it 113 verses net, besides a *long* soliloquy at its end; so that, in place of the 21 lines of monologue that now divide Mime's "wohin?" from the Wanderer's entry, the original edition had a scene and monologue amounting together to 182! The figures in themselves are ominous, in view of the great length to which the 'exposition' had already run. Shall we find that the matter of these extra lines was of sufficient weight to justify their presence here? A brief summary may help us to answer that question.*

You need no telling that Mime's "Halte! halte! wohin?" is lost on deaf ears in the later version, and after three more lines of similar import he resigns himself to lonely meditations on the impossible task just set him. In the original poem, on the contrary, or at least its first printed form, he manages to arrest the lad's flight on the specious pretext that he has yet another message for him from Sieglinde; though by the time the decoy word

* In the Appendix I supply a full translation of the whole episode, together with its sequel. 4v1

"mother" is pronounced, the youngster must be well out of earshot, however quick and loud the dwarf might shout—to say nothing of the deliberation implicit in the "Wie halt' ich das Kind mir fest?" To our amazement, the boy returns, all eagerness to hear this further message. But Mime is quite non-plussed at first, to invent a motive strong enough to keep the boy at home in future. The poet—here I cannot say, the dramatist—helps him out: Mime wanted a motive, the poet wanted to introduce his Never-fear discovery. Mime accordingly trumps up a story that would have been transparent enough to Siegfried, had he lived a few centuries later and read the tale of Parzival and Herzeleide, the story of a mother who fain would guard her son from peril by keeping him back from "the world." But Mime knows from experience how easy Siegfried is to gull, and artfully concocts a verbal injunction of the dying Sieglinde's, that the lad must never leave the forest till he has learnt to fear. With considerable ingenuity and many a wise saw, does Mime work out this motive, interrupted by little more than the lad's asseverations of his eagerness to learn the unknown feeling. Nevertheless there is an air of forcedness about the whole scene until Siegfried breaks it off, and upsets the ancient's calculations, by incontinently remarking that as there is no possibility of learning to fear under Mime's tuition—a possibility which his entire ignorance of the feeling would make it absolutely impossible for him to gauge—he will be off to the world all the same, where at least there seems chance of a lesson. Once again he bids Mime get ready his sword for the journey, almost in the same words that nowadays precede his "Aus dem Wald fort," and *once again he rushes into the wood* to stretch his legs. Mime, left alone, indulges in a monologue of 55 verses, in which the only material difference from his present 22 consists in his *here* conceiving the notion of luring the boy to Fafner's cave by the promise of an object-lesson in fear. All that Mime has gained by the recall, then, is a confirmation of the boy's craving for the unknown.

The Fear-episode in the 53 edition, however, is not quite ended even yet, since we have just seen it threatening a sequel. Between the two comes the Wanderer-Mime scene, with hardly the minutest variant from its present wording until we reach the Wanderer's final answer and parting admonition, the variation in which is of such importance that I will give the two versions side by side:—

1853 edition.	1863 onward.
Jetzt, Fafner's kühner Bezwinger,	Jetzt, Fafner's kühner Bezwinger,
hör', verfallener Zwerg :—	hör, verfallener Zwerg :—
nur Siegfried selbst	nur wer das Fürchten
schmiedet sein Schwert.	nie erfuhr,
(Mime starrt ihn gross an : er wendet sich zum Fortgange.)	schmiedet Nothung neu.
Dein kluges Haupt	(Mime starrt ihn gross an : er wendet sich zum Fortgange.)
behalt' für dich ;	Dein weises Haupt
nutzloses ist mir nicht noth :	wahre von heut' ;
doch hüt' es wohl	verfallen—lass' ich's dem,
von heute an !	der das Fürchten nicht gelernt.
Hab' Acht, wenn die Zunge dir schwankt,	(Er lacht und geht in den Wald.)
schwatze kein albernes Zeug ! *	
(Er lacht und geht in den Wald.)	

Of the right-hand column I need offer no translation here; the version printed in 1853 may be rendered as follows :—"Hear, Fafner's dauntless vanquisher! hear now, forfeited dwarf: Siegfried alone can forge his sword. (Mime stares at him, open-mouthed: he turns to go.) Thy cunning head I give thee back; of the useless I have no need. But guard it well from this day forth: set a watch on thy wagging tongue; chatter no stupid stuff!"—Not a word about fear here; not a word to set Mime in that state of terror which rolls him presently to the ground behind the anvil. Rather, the interview may be said to have ended satisfactorily for the dwarf beyond all expectation, alike his own and ours: he had lost his head in the wager, yet it is returned him with what looks like a piece of surprisingly good news, namely that the absolutely inexpert forest-lad will (or, can?) himself make that Nothung whole again whereon the cunning Mime has wasted years of labour.

---

* In the *Bayr. Bl.* 1896, von Wolzogen caps these two lines with verse 28 from Hâvamâl of the older Edda :

"Der schwatzt zuviel, der nimmer schweigt
eitel unnützer Worte.
Die zappelnde Zunge, die ungezäumt,
ergellt sich selten Gutes !"

As, on the same authority, counterparts of other verses in Hâvamâl are to be found in the earlier Fear-scene, there can be no doubt that the above formed part of the *original* conception—a point to be returned to.

After Mime's as yet unaccountable collapse (identical in both printed versions), Siegfried returns in 1853 with the same inquiries after the sword as those we know so well to-day; but from the dwarf's second reply to him, "Das Schwert? das Schwert?" (foot of p. 29 textbook) to "der fänd' wohl eher die Kunst" (top of p. 34) we have in '53 an entirely different and much shorter reading. Naturally it would be shorter, since the "fear" topic had been wellnigh exhausted in the previous scene, and nothing remained but to connect the idea in Siegfried's mind with that of Fafner as a likely teacher. For the *third* time Siegfried bids Mime set to work on the sword; a task shirked by the dwarf on the feeble plea that "you'll never learn fear through a sword baked by *me*"—which is almost the opposite of his present suggestion (inspired by the Wanderer), to wit, that the sword itself can be forged by none but the fearless.

Thenceforward the two versions are in close agreement till we arrive at Mime's "Mit dem Schwert gelingt's"; from which point to the end of that speech, "wie den Furchtlosen selbst ich bezwäng" (pp. 35-6), the first edition has a completely different and necessarily much weaker reading :—

Ein Wanderer kam,
der wusste viel;
mich schalt er dumm und schal:
doch was ich nicht wusste,
jetzt geschieht's,
und mir geschieht's zu nutz :—
wer nennt mich nun nicht gescheit?

Der Menschen Witz
meistert' ich noch;
mit dem Fürchten fing ich ihn doch:
er selbst schmiedet
das nütze Schwert ;—
er fällt mir Fafner zu todt :—
hei, Wandrer! gefällt dir mein Witz?

A traveller came,
of knowledge full;
he dubbed me fool and dullard:
yet what I knew not,
comes to pass,
and comes to serve my purpose :—
who'll tax me now with folly?

Of cunning, too,
the art I've learnt;
the Fear bait fairly hooked him:
himself he welds
the sword of need ;—
and Fafner will he fell me :—
Hé, Wand'rer! how lik'st thou my wit?

Here you will remark that Mime is filled with nothing but delight at the success of his "fear" bait, its cajoling of the intract-

able scapegrace to a task beyond his master's skill. In the later version, on the other hand, Mime's feelings are much more complex: his admiring astonishment at the fulfilment of the Wanderer's prophecy promptly passes into terror at the thought that the selfsame characteristic, which is enabling Siegfried to forge the sword, is the one that marks the youth as entering straightway on the reversion to Mime's own wager-lost head. The dwarf's only visible chance of rescuing that head, is that Fafner may teach Siegfried to fear; but—in the latter event, how is the ring to be won at all? It *is* a terrible "fix" (*verfluchte Klemme*) in the more recent version; but in that printed in 1853 it did not exist, since the Wanderer had already made Mime a free gift of his head on sole condition that he should not "chatter" (with a forward glance at the double-tongued scene in act ii).

To round off the change, comes a final substitution. In place of Mime's first nine lines on page 37 ("Er schmiedet das Schwert . . . und berge heil mein Haupt") and the upper eleven of 38 ("Sinnlos sinkt er in Schlaf . . . Rath und Ruh?"), the 1853 edition had the following :—

Nun fällt im Kampfe Fafner :
hab' ich das kühn erreicht,
gewinn' ich mir Ring und Hort,
walte als Niblungen-Herr.—
Der Knabe kennt nicht den Ring,
nichts errieth er vom Hort :—
im Weg doch stünd' er mir wohl?
verböt' die Beute dem Zwerg?—
Dass ich nicht wieder mich fange,
fällt mir ein Rath wohl ein :
["rang er sich müd'" etc.]
. . . . . .
sinnlos sinkt er in Schlaf :
so räum' ich ihn leicht aus der Welt,*
und den Ring erlang' ich für mich.—
Hei Wandrer! gefällt dir mein Witz?

So Fafner is slain in the fight :
once that I've attained,
I win me both ring and hoard,
reign as the Nibelungs' head.—
Of the ring the boy knows not,
naught has he heard of the hoard :
yet haply he'd stand in my way,
forbid the dwarf the booty?—
Not to be foiled yet again,
this were it better to follow :
[development of his drugging plan, as in later version] . . .
sound asleep will he sink :
out of the world I put him with ease,
and come by the ring for myself.—
Hé Wand'rer! how lik'st thou my wit?

* As a small detail, it may be noticed that the 53 edition does not yet specify the precise means whereby Siegfried is to be made riddance of, as in the later version, "mit der eig'nen Waffe, die er sich gewonnen, räum' ich ihn" etc.

In the last quotation, the principal point to remark is the relative purposelessness of Mime's drugging plan: if he had succeeded in cajoling the lad thus far, his end might easily be gained without a needless murder. There would be *some* object in it, no doubt, as an additional precaution; but that motive would have nothing like the cogence of the present forfeiture of the dwarf's own head "to him who knows no fear." Beyond that, as Wolzogen has justly observed (*Bayr. Bl.* 1896), in the earlier version the second passage ends with nothing but a refrain from the first; whereas in the later version the whole second passage forms at once a dramatic climax and a vivid contrast to the first—here Mime has worked out a most ingenious extrication from the terrible dilemma into which the Wanderer's decree had cast him, and now may safely congratulate himself on the profit to accrue to him from Fafner's death.

All this has followed from that one brief variant at the end of the riddling scene: at last the "fearless" motive has acquired a real significance. In the first instance it was not a particularly happy discovery, that of Siegfried's being the lad who could not learn to fear, as will be readily seen after examining the original episode; nothing but a somewhat tedious protraction of an already over-lengthy scene did it effect, while it emphasised no element in the hero's character that would not be taken for granted in any nominee for the office of dragon-slayer. *Then* its chief artistic value resided in its humorous potentialities, deliciously worked out in act ii, where Mime asks Siegfried, "nun kommt dir das Fürchten wohl an?" or bids him signal how he "likes it" (*wenn dir das Fürchten gefällt*). *Now* it is as if a sudden intuition had revealed to the dramatist the true constructive benefit of an idea that had more or less hampered the poet: with the dilemma into which Mime is thrown, both the Wanderer's visit and the examination in fear acquire a purpose, while they are also brought into association with the last words of *Die Walküre* —the latter connection suggesting another problem, to which I will return in an instant. Meanwhile it should be observed that the *musician*, i.e. the dramatic composer, was almost as much embarrassed by this Fear idea as the poet at first had been; its purely *physical* side was the only one to which he eventually gave drastic expression, whereas the actual "fearless" motive, being itself no more than a negation, has received a musical form so

difficult to grasp, that not one of the theme-hunting analysts has as yet unearthed it, at anyrate publicly * ;—

SIEGFRIED, Act i



Wanderer. Nur wer das Fürch-ten nie er - fuhr,

PARSIFAL.



Durch Mit - leid wissend, der rei - ne Thor,

For sufficient reason has the *Siegfried* "fearless" theme attracted little, if any attention hitherto, since it is not employed beyond the limits of act i, nor there save in the following places, so far as I have been able to trace it:—the Wanderer's decree itself; after Mime's "Das Schwert, wie möcht' ich's schweissen?" (textbook 29-30); with his "Wie bring' ich das Fürchten ihm bei?" and "das Fürchten lernt' ich fur dich," etc. (30, 31); with his "Fafner lehrt dich das Fürchten" and "Wer das Fürchten nicht kennt" (33, 34). Clearly, not having so inevitable a sound as most of his other 'leitmotive,' it slipped the composer's own memory, and therefore was made no use of in later situations where the text itself might have seemed to warrant it. And that, in turn, reduces the serious value of the mental concept itself for any but the one particular juncture to which it may be said to have given tardy birth—viz. Mime's dilemma.

Before leaving this almost disregarded musical theme, I will ask you to compare it with that of the youth whose fearing mother had in reality kept him from "the world" as long as she was able, the youth whose character is distinguished by something

* Months after this chapter was written, I find in the last quarterly number of the *Bayr. Blätter* for 1903 a citation of the "Nur wer das Fürchten nie erfuhr" passage in course of the last of a series of articles on "Musikalisch-dramatische Parallelen," written nearly twelve years back by "various" un-named authors. My statement holds good, however, since even in this article there is no indication that the "fearless" theme is made use of more than once; here it is cited as a declamatory parallel to the "reiner Thor" motive in *Parsifal*—an observation I welcome as independently confirming my own suggestion.

more than mere absence of fear. I have set the two themes side by side, and surely a casual glance will shew that the one is an unconscious development of the other. Both Siegfried and Parsifal are "simpletons" to begin with, but the one has evolved to a truly "world-redeeming" knowledge through acquisition of that *Mitleid* in which the other shews himself so singularly deficient (save for a few tiny traits in the "young" drama). The absence of fear will not of itself equip a hero for the responsibilities of fullgrown man's estate, however attractive a characteristic it may be in callow youth; and it is the unreasoning fearlessness of Siegfried, the overweening reliance on his inexperienced senses, that brings tragedy to all with whom he comes in contact, once he has left the safe confines of his woodland solitude or cage. Undoubtedly it was a character as worthy of dramatic treatment as that of Othello, for instance; but when it comes to the ethical elevation of such a type above that of the youth who "knew through compassion," I often wonder which of the two the detractors of Parsifal would prefer to have as *friend*.

To return to the questions directly raised by that remarkable variant of act i *Siegfried:* When was the alteration effected?

Certainly not until after the letter of January 1854 to Roeckel, or it would have been mentioned in company with the much slighter change in *Rheingold*. The actual date cannot at present be fixed, but a probable would be the Spring of 1856, when Wagner had just completed the score of his *Walküre* and was undergoing another nerve-cure to brace him for the music of *Siegfried* (begun that September) — a time when the poetic element was reasserting its rights with the mental shaping of *Tristan* and *Die Sieger*. To gain fresh inspiration in advance of the *Siegfried* music, we may well picture him restudying his poem, and, with 'Wotan's Farewell' still ringing in his head, "Wer meines Speere's Spitze fürchtet, durchschreite das Feuer nie" would naturally suggest the Wanderer's "Nur wer das Fürchten nie erfuhr" etc., and thus pitch the key for the whole recasting of the *Siegfried* fear-episode. The only wonder is, that those last words of Wotan's in *Die Walküre* did not suggest the very same change at the great revisal in 1852. Perhaps they would have, had *Die Walküre*, and not *Das Rheingold*, been the poem then last finished.

Now, the mere fact that in 1852 "nur Siegfried selbst etc." was left as it stood, shews that very little alteration of any kind can have then been made in act i of *Siegfried*. That, of course, is taking for granted that this passage also formed part of the *earliest* poem; an assumption borne out by the resemblance already-noted (*27n ant.*) between the "schwatze kein albernes Zeug" and that Eddaic Hâvamâl which appears to have acted as model for the didactics of the original fear-lesson itself. Yet there are two points connected with the fear-episode which still remain open to question, namely the immediate introductions to what were then its two dissevered parts.

These introductions do not seem quite to fit the original, and more especially the first of them. How could the poet's genetic inspiration have possibly conceived the youth as returning at Mime's call, immediately after a brilliant exit? No: in the summer of 1851 the Siegfried-Mime scene must have been unbroken from the boy's first entry with the bear to his jaunty departure with the threat that the dwarf shall receive a sound thrashing if the sword be not ready by his return; then, upon reading it through for the 52 revision, or in the act of fair-copying,* the author must have grown alarmed at its excessive length, and hastily introduced the false exit, for sake of an apparent break. A very few sentences would do it; sentences one might easily bracket to-day as intruders (see App. 421 *inf.*). On this hypothesis the final change, of circa '56, would be somewhat in the nature of a restitutio ad integrum: the fear-episode becomes one whole (again?), albeit in a vastly better mould, and is transferred to Siegfried's voluntary return after the Wanderer scene; the necessity for a false exit is done away with, and the "Aus dem Wald fort"—which originally would have been a mere declaration of future plans—literally leaps to full dramatic significance. As said, this is pure conjecture, possibly to be upset by an eventual resurrection of the buried first poem, but I fancy it offers a plausible explanation of what was a decided blemish on the edition of 1853.

The other doubtful point in this connection is Mime's fit of terror after the Wanderer's departure, leading to the briefer second

* Possibly even in the interregnum between "the two Siegfrieds" and the tetralogy scheme, early autumn 1851.

instalment of the fear-episode in the aforesaid edition. It is all perfectly natural *now:* Mime's head lies forfeit to him who has never learnt fear; but then it was by no means forfeit, or rather, it had been restored as a free gift, with the very mild warning to be more careful of it in future: why the terror? In the edition of '53 it is little more than a repetition of the attack that had seized the dwarf *before* the Wanderer's arrival, and the repetition is far less justified than that first attack itself. If it existed at all in the earliest poem ('51), it must surely have been as sequel to some train of thought discarded in the '52 revision. Indeed there still remains a hint of such omission, since from '53 onward the stage-directions tell us that "he stares vacantly before him into the sunlit forest.—*After a long silence* he begins to tremble violently." That silence is significant, with so talkative a little dwarf; and when at last he breaks it, it is in language that distinctly suggests the poet of *Rheingold* until we come to the six concluding verses, in which his fear of the light suddenly changes into dread of Fafner with "Ein grässlicher Rachen reisst sich mir auf," manifestly conceived in that spirit of comedy which distinguishes the earlier from the later version of almost all the passages just dealt with. That the lines last quoted are '51 work, is certain, as we find them repeated in act ii (p. 50), and in a situation where there can be no question of a change. Consequently I should guess that in the original poem the dwarf had developed a private intermezzo out of the Wanderer's words "Fafner's kühner Bezwinger," until he worked himself into tragi-comic terror of a Worm into whose closer neighbourhood he was so soon to be journeying. So that "Der Wurm will mich fangen! Fafner! Fafner!" would really be a survival from a previous stage of the poem's evolution: a very effective, if somewhat inconsequent survival in the later editions, but considerably discounted in that of '53 by the fact that in his monologue before the Wanderer's entry Mime had already quite placidly made up his mind to lead the lad to "Fafner's nest."—As to the "Verfluchtes Licht" of all the printed versions, it of course is the light of Wotan's motion; but in the original poem of '51 had Mime the slightest inkling of the personality of his visitor?

Before we can answer that question, we must examine the scene that separates the two sections of the fear-episode in the first edition, the interview between the Wanderer and Mime. It

will be remembered that this was one of the scenes which Wagner once proposed to modify. That he did not carry out that proposal, save for a minor touch or two in 1852, I have already advanced as my personal belief (vol. iii, 446). I have now to vindicate that belief, and will begin with a word or two about its scheme of versification.

In a brief article contributed to the *Bayr. Blätter* 1897 (pp. 150-3) Dr Rudolf Schlösser first drew attention to the "*strophic*" form as particularly well-marked in the scene between Alberich and Mime, act ii. Quite recently the Professor informs me that he has since arrived at the opinion that this "strophic" form is peculiarly a characteristic of the *Siegfried* poem itself, and thus of the 1851 work, as distinguished from the other members of the *Ring*, in which it occurs much more rarely; wherever we find that form in *Siegfried*, we may be fairly confident that we are dealing with a practically unaltered part of the original poem. The rule must not be taken to imply its converse, for the necessities of *dramatic* dialogue, where action or passion gains the upper hand, must naturally play havoc with mere formal symmetry; but, as a general principle, on its positive side it is a distinct reinforcement to our critical means of divination.*

Now, if we apply this gauge to the Wanderer-Mime scene, we shall find the latter falling into strophe and antistrophe almost throughout, albeit displaying much variety of type. Each of the Wanderer's first three speeches consists of 4 lines, and is built on the same model, whilst Mime replies with 3-line sets; then come two sevens, each followed by a six; then groups of three lines, till we arrive at the more complex pattern of the Wanderer's answers to Mime's first two riddles, the second answer being an almost perfect counterpart of the first; and so on throughout the scene, with scarcely more than two, and those two most enlightening, exceptions. The parallelism in sheer outward form, then, of itself points to this scene as an integral reproduction from the original poem. Even from a bibliographic point of view that inference must needs be of interest, but when we remember that in the summer of 51 the "Gods' myth" had not yet acquired its

* Certainly we find traces of this form in *Die Walküre*, *Rheingold*, and even in the new Norns' scene, but with a frequency diminishing in proportion to the distance of time from the first *Young Siegfried* poem.

"preciser physiognomy" (see vol. iii, 331), it may also account for certain puzzling features in the Wanderer's replies themselves. Let me take these seriatim.

In the Wanderer's answer to Mime's first riddle the Ring is given quite a secondary importance, as compared with the Hoard: "eines Zauberringes zwingende Kraft zähmt' ihm das fleissige Volk"—the ring merely bent the Nibelungs to Alberich's purpose, which is revealed in the next lines: "Reicher Schätze schimmernden Hort häuften sie ihm: der sollte die Welt ihm gewinnen" —the hoard was therefore the main consideration even in the Wanderer's eyes. With our riper knowledge of the plot, we should have fully expected the ring itself to be made the principal object; but the whole story becomes clear on the assumption that it is 51 work, for these lines are almost a literal transcription from the original *Siegfrieds Tod*, where Alberich himself tells Hagen (*Ges. Schr. II.* 248), ". . einen Ring: durch seines Zaubers zwingende Kraft zähmt' ich das fleissige Volk . . . Den gewaltigen Hort häufte ich so, der sollte die Welt mir gewinnen." Thus the Wanderer's first answer is textually borrowed from the very oldest member of the organism, and from the oldest version of a scene which, as I hope to be able to convince you hereafter, must have been entirely recast for *Siegfrieds Tod* itself about the time that *Young* Siegfried was written. So plainly borrowed is it, that even the first three lines, "In der Erde Tiefe tagen die Nibelungen: Nibelheim ist ihr Land," are but a condensation of Alberich's "Dem Tod und der Nacht in Nibelheim's Tiefe entkeimten die Nibelungen . . . regen die Erde sie auf" (*ibid.*)

To the second riddle the Wanderer also replies in terms partly taken from the same speech of Alberich's in the older *S. Tod*, again accounting for what may best be described as an inferential anachronism: "Fasolt und Fafner, der Rauhen Fürsten, neideten Nibelung's Macht; den gewaltigen Hort gewannen sie sich, errangen mit ihm den Ring." True, the statement in itself contains nothing at direct variance with the plot of *Rheingold*, but when we interpret it in the light of Mime's remark in act ii, "Dir Zagem entrissen ihn Riesen" (textbook 62), it distinctly conveys the impression that the Giants themselves had wrested the hoard and ring from Alberich direct. And in that speech of Alberich's in the older *Tod* we have the Giants' *envy* of his power made the incentive of their "offer" to build the Gods a burg; "Da regte

ich Sorge den Riesen auf, die Plumpen plagte *der Neid;* den jungen Göttern *boten* sie Gunst," and so on; whereas the "*gewaltigen* Hort" we have already encountered there. Moreover the expression "der Rauhen Fürsten"—i.e. the rulers of that "*race* of Giants which weighs on Earth's loins" ("*auf der Erde Rücken wuchtet der Riesen Geschlecht*")—intensifies the said anachronism, especially when combined with "Riesenheim *ist* ihr Land"; for the Giants are here spoken of as still in plurality, even after the death of Fasolt, though Fafner himself on the very next day (act ii) uses language implying that he and Fasolt had originally constituted the whole "Geschlecht," and goes on to say, "Fafner, den *letzten* Riesen, fällte ein rosiger Held"; so that we have two distinct conceptions in 51 and 52, since there can be no doubt that the Worm's dying speech was revised at the latter date. Finally, the last line of the solution, "hütet nun Fafner den Hort," again gives pre-eminence to the hoard itself, in lieu of the ring.*

The Wanderer's answers to the first and second riddles we thus may claim as absolutely unaltered portions of the original poem of *Young Siegfried.* With his third answer the case is slightly different. Its first six and last six verses are manifestly assignable to '51, but the intervening fourteen are debatable, were it only that in themselves they cover as much space as the whole of the preceding answer. Let me deal with this third answer in detail, as anything so closely concerning the protagonist of the whole tetralogy is bound to offer more than usual interest:—

As to its first six lines, their form exactly corresponds to that of the opening six of the first answer; their sense has nothing inconsistent with the riper myth, it is true, yet one would scarcely have expected Wotan to speak of himself as "Licht-Alberich" in 52, notwithstanding that Alberich distinguishes in *Rheingold* between "Schwarz-Alben" and "Licht-Alben." The last six lines, however, are quite incompatible with the argument of 52. "Ihm neigte sich der Niblungen Heer" is itself a relic from the older *Tod;* "der Riesen Gezücht zähmte sein Rath" might in-

* I will not deny that this may be simply for sake of alliteration, as I have already instanced a case in *Rheingold* itself (vol. iii, 422); nevertheless we have seen the tendency to attach chief importance to the hoard, albeit a short-lived tendency, exhibited only six months before *Siegfried* was written (ibid. 490).

differently have come from *Rheingold;* but when we arrive at "*ewig gehorchen sie alle* des Speeres starkem Herrn," and remember that the only Nibelung worth counting (apart from Mime himself) is in declared opposition to Wotan, whilst the only surviving Giant is possessor of that hoard and ring which Wotan dare not touch, the said "obedience" vanishes to limbo.—As to the fourteen intervening lines, I should imagine them to have been represented by no more than three in the original poem, very sketchily dealing with the "Speer, den Wotan's Faust umspannt," and thus conforming to the pattern of the first two answers. In any case the first twelve at least of these fourteen lines bear not only the sense, but also the sound of 52 work, as you will see at once when you turn to the brand-new Norns' scene, and find there "weihlicher Aeste Wald" and "Treu berath'ner Verträge Runen schnitt Wotan in des Speeres Schaft: den hielt er als Haft der Welt."

The Wanderer's third answer, then—i.e. the answer that gives an outline of the god's own personality—would be one of those exceptions aforesaid. Here the poem of 51 does seem to have been retouched in 52-3. To follow the change up, it is possible that the stage-direction was now introduced according to which the speaker terrifies Mime by striking his spear against the ground, though it is somewhat significant that not even in the printed work of 53 was "low thunder" supposed to attend the shock and thus symbolically intimate the Wanderer's identity. The only expression of Mime's in all this act, in all the drama, that indicates an approach to such a suspicion, is "mir leuchtete Wotan's Auge, zur Höhle lugt' es herein: vor ihm magert mein Mutterwitz," just before he unwillingly submits in turn to cross-examination. In its very form this speech shews signs of alteration, as it begins with a strophic counterpart of its predecessor, but suddenly breaks the parallelism at the point in question, as if something had been either omitted or introduced. And that break in the versification coincides with a break in the sense, for, Mime's "Mutter Schoss" having lain deep in the bowels of earth, the "eye of Wotan" can never have been familiar to him in his "Heimathland": the two ideas are absolutely disconnected—save for a Mime who had played a small rôle in the third scene of *Rheingold.* Accordingly I should tentatively class these four lines with the "Verfluchtes Licht etc." that follows the Wanderer's departure, as new matter interpolated during the

52 revision; unless, indeed, we are to suppose that they originally figured as an introduction to that monologue itself, after the manner of the Eddaic Vafthrudnersmal, where the *last* riddle terrifies Vafthrudner by the discovery that his questioner is none other than Odin.

Beyond these few touches, I should fancy that the Wanderer-Mime scene was reproduced in 1852-3 exactly as it stood in 1851. With the rest of the act, before and after the twofold fear-episode, there would be no motive for change; neither does the style of diction, nor the mode of versification, suggest aught but a homogeneous product. With acts ii and iii the case is quite different; but the conjecturable changes there I have already outlined in vol. iii (pp. 446-50), and they are of so intricate a nature that, fearing to weary the reader by too large a dose of argument, I shall relegate their minuter discussion to the Appendix. At best we are but groping in the dark whenever we try to reconstruct the first poem of the younger Siegfried, and never have I so keenly felt the necessity of caution in the attempt, as now; for what I have to relate concerning the original *Siegfried's Tod* will shew that one factor in the development of the "Gods' myth" had hitherto remained beyond our ken. So we will take a rest from conjectures, until we have tried the upshot of a new set of facts.

If the reader will kindly refer to pages 438-41 of vol. iii he will find a theory concerning an "interim revision" of *Siegfried's Tod*. That theory was based on internal evidence, somewhat akin to what I have just adduced regarding *Der junge Siegfried*, and it was with an under-current of fear and trembling that I was about to lay it before the world, when at the eleventh hour I received information which enabled me to add a footnote to p. 441, to the effect that I at last had "positive proof of the existence of at least *one* version of *Siegfried's Tod* intermediate between those of 1848 and 1852." The conditions under which I had obtained that information precluded my publishing any details for the nonce; but even without that embargo it would have been impossible to discuss so important a discovery at the fag end of a volume, more especially as there were several features that still required elucidation. That embargo has since been removed, those indeterminate features have now been focused, and half of

what was formerly a theory has become an established fact; whilst the other half, albeit it remains unproven, at least is not thereby *dis*proved. On the other hand, as it is the unforeseen that always arrives, the discovery has proved *more* than could ever have been anticipated; and thus, in addition to an entirely new set of facts, it presents us also with an entirely new problem. To revert to plain language, let me begin at the beginning.

Here, unlike that which we have had to take with the younger Siegfried, our journey lies between two fixed points: the libretto for an operatic *Siegfried's Tod*, written in 1848, but not published till many years after, among the contents of vol. ii of Wagner's *Gesammelte Schriften;* and the text of *Götterdämmerung*, for all practical purposes the same as the *S. Tod* first privately issued together with the other members of the RING in 1853. The later of these *S. Tods* is confessedly an emendation of the earlier, and we know that, besides the recasting of two or three whole scenes, a general revision of the poem was effected toward the end of 1852. That sounds simple enough, and it was presumed as a matter of course that all allusions to *S. Tod* in Wagner's letters down to December 1852 referred to that form of the poem which lies before us in *Ges. Schr.* ii, also that all departures from that form were the outcome of a revision undertaken in light of the whole tetralogy. The presumption, though endorsed implicitly or explicitly by every recognised authority, was really *much too* simple, for it left unexplained quite a number of most puzzling points: there were expressions, nay, whole passages in the final form that seemed incongruous in work of 1852, yet had no pre-existence in the 1848 original. This ultimately set me thinking, till it suddenly occurred to me that the creation of *D. j. Siegfried*, in the interval, would of itself necessitate some immediate alteration in its older companion. (You object to the "me"? But I cannot avoid it, if I am to give you the results of a quasi-personal exploration.—W. A. E.)

Another thing had puzzled me, at first quite independently. In the *Neujahrsblatt* of the Zurich Allg. Mus. Gesellschaft for 1901 Herr A. Steiner had remarked of Wagner's Zurich intimate, the late Jakob Sulzer, "He possessed the original manuscript of *Siegfried's Tod*, dedicated to him by Wagner; on the 26th Nov. 1866 Wagner wrote him from Lucerne, asking for a loan of the

manuscript for a little while, in order that he might have a duplicate made for King Ludwig. Instead of the original, Sulzer received back a carefully written copy furnished with a few autograph alterations by the author; the original was no longer to be recovered." What had perplexed me here, was not merely the statement that Sulzer had once possessed a manuscript which we afterwards find in the possession of Alex. Ritter (not of King Ludwig—see the facsimile in Chamberlain's *Richard Wagner*), but still more the implication that in 1866-7 Wagner had taken the trouble to get a "carefully written copy" made for Sulzer, as substitute for the original, and to *alter* that copy with his own hand! One fine day the two puzzles happened to jostle each other in what I humbly call my brain: eh, eh!—what if this "carefully written copy" should prove to be the one despatched to publisher Wigand in 1850, reclaimed from Uhlig in 1851, and possibly *then* "altered in Wagner's own hand" to make it fit the younger Siegfried (see vol. iii, 438-9)? The combination was a little too hasty, as the sequel will shew; it had slightly overshot the mark—yet good luck attended the random aim.

At once I wrote Herr Steiner, asking for certain particulars, and I cannot too cordially thank him for the immense amount of pains and trouble he has devoted to a research which I had instigated, indeed, but could never have pursued without him. His friendly relations with the heirs of Jakob Sulzer (†1897) made it possible for him to induce them to give him access to a document which family tradition had placed under rather a cloud; and at my suggestion he carefully, most carefully collated this unregarded "copy" with the *Siegfried's Tod* of 1848 (*Ges. Schr.* ii) and the *Götterdämmerung* textbook, ultimately also with the facsimile from a page of the manuscript of the former work reproduced in Mr H. S. Chamberlain's *Richard Wagner*. The result I can describe as nothing less than startling. Instead of a mere copy, the "Sulzer" manuscript turns out to be a holograph by Richard Wagner himself, and, what is far more to the point—

his actual fair-copy of the Dresden Siegfried's Tod.

The full significance of the latter fact cannot be gauged until I have gone into particulars, but I may say at once that, although the *Siegfried's Tod* of *Ges. Schr.* ii was only finished by Nov. 28, 1848, and this fair-copy must have been written while its author was still in Dresden, i.e. between that date and May 1849, it has

several sweeping alterations to shew, and all of them perpetuated in *Götterdämmerung!* So wholly unexpected an intimation perhaps will take your breath away, as it certainly took Herr Steiner's and my own, when conviction of the identity of the handwriting first dawned upon him.* But I can spare you no time to recover from a natural astonishment; details must be marshalled forthwith.

First, though it was the last to be established, I will take the handwriting question. The travelled English reader is of course aware that the German nation makes use of two different sets of characters in manual writing: the one, which they call "lateinische Schrift," is the same as that used by the Anglo-Celt and all the Romanic nations; the other, their "deutsche Schrift," is peculiar to themselves, luckily for our eyes: even when using "deutsche Schrift," however, they mostly write their signatures, dates and addresses in "lateinische"—more generally known as "Italian hand"—a very wise concession. Now, Wagner certainly used 'Italian hand' for names and addresses (whether some or all, does not matter) in his first Paris period; but in his Dresden years he even *signed* in German, as may be gathered from the facsimile of his letter of June '48 to von Lüttichau reproduced in Chamberlain's volume. When he left Dresden, however, he abandoned 'German hand' for good, as may be seen in the facsimile of *Art and Revolution* (ibid.). His reason for the change has never been stated, but I should imagine it to be a precaution against political espionage (Post-office); therefore I am inclined to locate the abandonment in May 1849, and not at the preceding Christmas, as had been too hastily assumed in venerable quarters. In either case, a manuscript in 'German hand,' and that hand Wagner's, could not possibly be of *later* date than April 1849.

Well, this manuscript is written *throughout* in 'German hand,' save for the added dedication on the title-page; even the "von Richard Wagner" of the formal title is traced in those characters

* Full extracts from Herr Steiner's letters to myself on the subject will be found in an article that appeared in *Die Musik* Feb.-March of this year (1904), shewing how complete is the evidence of authenticity. Had it been any other season than winter, with a volume passing through the press, I might have journeyed to Zurich myself, to verify the examination; but Herr Steiner's testimony on a question of *German* handwriting would in any case be of far more cogence than my own.

—and they are precisely the same, so Herr Steiner assures me, as the signature of the said letter to Lüttichau. Moreover, Herr Steiner has closely compared Siegfried's death-scene with the facsimile of the same scene in Mr Chamberlain's book, and finds that the minutest details of penmanship exactly correspond. It therefore is settled beyond a doubt, that the main body of this newly-discovered manuscript was written by Wagner himself, and written between the end of November 1848 and the beginning of May 1849. Also, as the document is a perfect model of caligraphy,* with but one erasure and two additions (to be dealt with hereafter), whereas the facsimile last-mentioned bears several corrections within the space of its few lines—it follows that the Sulzer heirloom is what I have claimed for it above, namely the original *fair-copy of the Dresden "Siegfried's Tod";* and that the poem published in vol. ii of the *Ges. Schriften* in reality presents the rougher state, or let us call it the penultimate stage of the same work, before it had received certain finishing touches as the result of second thoughts. We thus have acquired a third fixed point, albeit second in order, and for brevity sake may distinguish henceforward between the 1848, the "1849," and the 1852-3 *Siegfried's Tod.* With the preciser date to be conjectured of this new fixed point I propose to deal in due course, as no question concerning the early months of '49 can be a trivial one; but we must first make ourselves acquainted with all the idiosyncrasies of the recovered text itself:—

The title-page bears the words

SIEGFRIEDS TOD

Eine Heldenoper in drei Akten

von

Richard Wagner.

Beneath is added in Italian hand—the only instance of that mode of writing in all this document—

Behalt's für dich!

Seinem J. Sulzer

Richard Wagner.

* It is understood, of course, that my *evidence* is second-hand, unlike my exegesis; but I am not without hope that Sulzer's heirs will some day make public a few phototypes from this manuscript,—a course which should always be followed in the case of an important treasure-trove.

The tiny dedication ("A keepsake from Richard Wagner to his J. Sulzer") is accordingly of later date than the rest of the manuscript. This we should have anticipated in any case, since Wagner did not make Sulzer's acquaintance until he had left Dresden for good. Whether the dedication may date from the early fifties or the late sixties, is another question, but need not arrest us at present.

The sub-title "*Eine Heldenoper*," i.e. "An heroic opera," is of some moment, as it independently proves the manuscript to be at least of earlier origin than *Opera and Drama* (1850-1); already, however, we miss that predicate "*grosse*"—"grand"—which had worried us in the facsimile of the '48 title-page reproduced by Mr Chamberlain (*R. Wagner* p. 248). Yet another point is the foreign designation "Akten," as in the facsimile last-mentioned, in the draft of *Wieland der Schmiedt* (early '50), and the text of *Lohengrin* newly-copied for Weimar June-July '50 (see App.): in the '53 issue of the RING each act is styled an "Aufzug" (etymol. "pull-up," i.e. of curtain), as in all the later works and editions. In themselves, no doubt, these are trifles; but they help to confirm the date already assigned to the work.

We now arrive at the body of the text. The "Prolog"—thus styled, not "Vorspiel"—is verbatim the same as that of the 1848 version,* and accordingly has a Norns' scene completely different from that of *Götterdämmerung*. The first act also pursues its even tenour parallel with that of '48 down to the point where Siegfried is drugged; but after his "Brünnhilde, trink' ich dir" the whole episode in this fair-copy suddenly changes to the form preserved in *Gtdg*, down to the hero's taking of Gutrune's hand "with fiery impetuosity," whereas the version of '48 had made that a "gentle" action.† From this taking of Gutrune's hand down to Gunther's "ein Feuer umbrennt den Saal" all three versions are in agreement, save for an inconsiderable variant or two in the *Gtdg* wording as compared with both its forerunners; but at that point, namely with Siegfried's struggle to arrest a

* A translation of the whole 1848 poem will be found in Vol. VIII. of *Richard Wagner's Prose Works*.

† Merely one line of the '49 MS. differs here from *Gtdg*, namely in the absence of the words I now italicise, "Dic so *mit dem Blitz* den Blick du mir seng'st." Gutrune's name, moreover, is still spelt with a *d*, as is Wotan's throughout.

rapidly declining memory (whereof there was no hint in '48) the scene in 1849 already gains its full and ultimate development, until with the lines "Dein Mann bin ich," and so on, the three versions coincide again. Consequently, the whole episode of the magic potion, or "draught of oblivion," has evolved within a few weeks from a bald suggestion to a studied psychologic situation. The change is a distinct improvement, as replacing a washy outline by a sharp one; but its occurrence thus early should drive the last nail into the coffin of a 'symbolic' interpretation of the draught itself.

No further 1849 changes present themselves until we reach the departure of Siegfried and Gunther for Brünnhilde's rock. In 1848 Hagen was left alone, to hold his watch in silence: in *Gtdg* he has a soliloquy, the music whereof is one of the finest passages even in this drama of unrivalled sounds, but the words are somewhat tame and tell us little. It would have been a great falling off, had those words been written at the same epoch as the magnificent scene they usher in; wherefore it is quite a relief to find them syllable for syllable upon the manuscript of '49.—The ensuing scene for Brynhild and Waltraute we all know to be work of '52, so you will be prepared to hear that the choral scene for Valkyries, which it now replaces, is the same in the '49 fair-copy as it had been in the '48 original, except for tiniest variants.*

In the closing scene of act i, Brynhild's overmastering by the disguised Siegfried, this fair-copy exhibits a very notable departure from the *S. Tod* of Nov. '48, since the hero's attitude has been entirely reconceived. This is one of the reasons why I confidently assign the fair-copy to 1849, rather than to the end of the preceding year: at least a few weeks must be allowed for the change of conception alike in this and the potion scene, and for their rough-drafting prior to a spotless engrossment. Here we already have the final version of the scene, word for word as it

---

* However infinitesimal they be, I must not deny the connoisseur an opportunity of judging for himself. Where p. 241 of *Ges. Schr.* ii says "Das zäumt nun Siegfried, da *in Streit* er zog," the '49 MS. says "streitwärts," and a few lines lower "O bränne" in place of "O brennte." In the longest stage-direction represented on p. 242 *ibid.*, "unter Blitz und Donnerschlag" is interpolated before "ringsum," and Brynhild is described as "in feierlicher [not "heiliger"] Ergriffenheit";—the conversion of "holy" into "solemn" may be taken as a straw to indicate which way the wind begins to veer.

stands in *Gtdg* to-day, save for a "Wodan" in place of "Wotan," a "Balmung" in place of "Nothung"; barely recognisable in aught but its termination as a derivative from that recorded in *Ges. Schr.* ii (compare *P.* VIII. with *Gtdg* 35-6). The '48 original was pitched in a plainly false key; in his assumed character of Gunther, Siegfried there was made to *insult* his own wife, and with accusations such as could not possibly have come to his ears in the brief interval since his selective loss of memory, seeing that Gunther himself had only just heard of the fire-fenced maid. In every way the original scene was a mistake, except perhaps for its accumulation of motives for Brynhild's subsequent vengeance; and of those she still has more than ample to justify the most implacable revenge. By abridging it, and purging it of Siegfried's taunts, Wagner has converted it into one of the most tragical links in all the plot. This, we now see, he had already done by the time the Dresden fair-copy was taken in hand.

Had this manuscript been of later date than 1849, it might have thrown light on certain enigmas in the opening scene of act ii *Gtdg*. Being of the date I have already proved it to be, you will not be surprised to hear that the said scene between Alberich and Hagen is strictly identical with the '48 version.* Nothing new does the fair-copy present in this act till we arrive at the trifling variant "den zu zertrümmern, der sie betrog," now finally replacing "den zu vernichten, der sie verrieth," in Brynhild's "Heil'ger Götter! himmlische Lenker" speech (cf. textbook p. 52). But the end of this same "scene 4" already foreshadows a change in the end of the act itself:—

The spear-oath has been sworn by hero and heroine, and Siegfried has turned to his host with the words "Gunther! wehre deinem Weibe." From those words down to "lasst das Weibergekeif'!" the three versions thoroughly concur.† Then the '48

* To be quite accurate, the words "im Hintergrunde" are interpolated after "nach rechts" in the opening stage-directions, the spelling "Fessel" replaces "Füssel" (cf. *Ges. Schr.* ii, 249), and three lines lower "ihn auch" is reversed to "auch ihn." That is absolutely all. Nevertheless I have by no means been beaten off my theory of an interim revision of this opening scene, to which I shall stubbornly return when done with the fair copy.

† The "Weibergekeif" is a reminiscence of the "women's wrangle" in the *Nibelungenlied*, and points to some similar incident in the first (prose?) draft of Wagner's poem, as there is nothing to which it could properly apply in any of the finished versions.

gives Siegfried but six lines more, in which, dropping the subject of dispute, he invites the men and women to assist him in preparing for the wedding ceremony. The fair-copy, however, agrees with *Gtdg* in giving the hero ten additional lines concerning the scandal, only the last two whereof display a tiny shade of variation. Now, all but the first two of these ten additional verses have been bodily transferred from the original "sixth," or closing scene of '48; nor is that quite all, for in the fair copy they are interpolated before the six lines aforesaid ("Auf, kommt für den Weihstein &c."), and with the latter are also incorporated two further lines from the original sixth scene, namely "von Frauen nahm ich frische Kränze, lustiger Bänder bunte Zier" (*Ges. Schr.* ii, 273). This change then, though of no esoteric importance, bears evidence of some constructional deliberation between November 1848 and the engrossment of the fair copy. To make it perfectly clear, I will reproduce the new-discovered variant from the point where it begins to part company with the *Gtdg* version:—"Doch Frauengroll friedet sich bald—dass ich sie dir gewann, dankt sie mir noch. (Sich wieder zu den Mannen wendend.) Auf! kommt, für den Weihstein weidliche Stiere zu schmücken! Folget in's Weihgeheg, für Fro den Eber zu fangen! (zu den Frauen) Auch ihr, helfet zur Hochzeit, schafft frische Kränze zum Fest, lustiger Bänder bunte Zier! Auf, folget Gudrunen, ihr Frau'n! (Er geht mit Gudrune in die Halle, Mannen und Frauen folgen ihnen)." That is the end of the fourth scene in the fair-copy, which thus remains hovering between the '48 and final versions. And that is what makes it historic; for the *final* version (cf. *Gtdg*) omits all Siegfried's words about religious rites, just as it had previously omitted his invocation to Wodan to bless the spear, but substitutes twelve lines ("Munter, ihr Mannen . . . thu' es der Glückliche gleich") whose diction falls so palpably below the level of 1852 that we perforce must look for another intermediate revision to account therefor—a point I reserve for combination with other scattered hints.

Passing to the "fifth scene," Brünnhilde, Hagen and Gunther, the fair copy has precisely the same reading as *Ges. Schr.* ii (i.e. mere infinitesimal differences from *Gtdg*) so far as that scene originally went, namely to the end of the trio's first stanza, "mit seinem Blut büss' er die Schuld" (B. and G.) and "entrissen d'rum sei ihm der Ring" (H.). Then comes a radical divergence;

there is no longer a sixth scene at all, merely the close of the old one being tacked on to the fifth. This is so momentous a change, owing to its after-effects, that I must summarise the '48 "sixth scene" itself:—Siegfried and Gudrune re-enter from the inner hall, he wreathed with oak-leaves, she with flowers; Siegfried gaily chides Gunther for having left the festal preparations to his guest (here comes the "frische Kränze" passage); Gunther replies with simulated calm and ironical courtesy; Siegfried asks if he has "tamed the shrew"; Gunther, "she is still"; Siegfried, "mich zürnt's etc." (*vid. sup.*); Gunther, "Of thanks she'll not be chary"; Gudrune for her part makes shy advances to Brynhild, who coldly replies with a veiled threat and waves her to Siegfried; from the courtyard is heard the ceremonial hymn, "Allvater! Waltender Gott &c.," during which Siegfried and Gunther offer each other precedence; then all but Hagen pass into the hall.—As you have already heard that the fair-copy transfers one and part of another of the above speeches of the hero to the end of the *fourth* scene, you will have correctly inferred that the whole brief comedy of simulation has disappeared, leaving nothing of what had once constituted a sixth scene beyond its choruses.* But—with those choruses *what* do we here find combined? That **final stanza** for the three conspirators, which had so astonished us in *Götterdämmerung* owing to its non-existence in the *S. Tod* of '48, the only prior version hitherto known. To enable the reader to realise its situation, I will describe the exact disposition of the '49 fair-copy as clearly as is possible on a page not wide enough to admit a graphic reproduction:—

Gunther and Brünnhilde exclaim "So soll es sein, Siegfried falle! . . . büss' er die Schuld!" while Hagen exclaims "So soll es sein, Siegfried falle! . . . sei ihm der Ring!" just as in the '48 version and *Gtdg*, save that the fair-copy writes their words in parallel left and right columns. Immediately after this the '49 manuscript breaks into *three* columns, Gunther and Brünnhilde

* Instead of the two couples passing into the inner hall (as in '48) at the curtain's fall, the stage-directions on this fair copy are identical with those of 1852-3 (cf. *Gtdg* textbook), i.e. they somewhat vaguely imply that the whole party, except Hagen, is bound for the altars on the rising ground at the back of the stage; a scheme not fully elaborated, in print at least, until the 1872 edition of *Gtdg* in vol. vi of the *Gesammelte Schriften*.

occupying the central one, the Weihgesang (double chorus of men and women) the left, Hagen the right: Gunther, Bde and Hagen are given the identical words of their second and last stanza in *Gtdg*, namely "Allrauner etc." and "Albenvater etc."; and that new stanza is manifestly devised to chime with the double chorus, which (save for a "hehre" in lieu of "herrliche") is taken bodily over from the original close of the act as recorded in *Ges. Schr.* ii.

The secret is out. Now we know how that harassing last stanza of the conspirators' trio crept into the end of act ii of *Götterdämmerung:* in the first instance it formed part of the text for a palpable *grand-opera finale*, an ensemble with double chorus. Now we know how that embarrassing "Wotan, wende dich her!", that mysterious "schrecklich heilige Schaar," and that incongruous "gefallener Fürst," came to trouble the Gods'-myth of 1852: they were a survival from the Dresden period. It would not be very adventurous to assume that the whole combination was urged on the author by his old friend Chorus-master Fischer at the recitation in December 1848 (see vol. ii, 280-1).

But how did it happen that those lines for the trio were preserved, though their accompanying chorus was cast adrift? There we have another suggestion of the hypothetic revision of 1851: after *Opera and Drama* the chorus would be cancelled as a matter of principle, but the appeal to Wotan might not necessarily appear incongruous at a time when the Gods'-myth was not yet definitely focused, and in particular before the Waltraute scene had been conceived. This may prove a useful hint in the future, though the date of *excision* of these choruses is scarcely a point on which I should care to dogmatise. For the present it is sufficient gain, to have irrefutable evidence that the disturbing words which end act ii of *Gtdg* are *not* the work of the dramatist of 1852.

Act iii. The text of 1849 is in literal agreement with that of 1848 till close upon its end. Yet it displays an interesting little group of pencil-marks on the margin of Siegfried's long narration. In the original *S. Tod* of '48 the first two woodbird-songs were given in the reverse order to that which they assume in *D. j. Siegfried:* naturally this fair copy reproduces that original order, as the days of *D. j. S.* were still far distant; but a subsequent pencil has marked against these first two songs "2/" and "1/"

respectively, on the fair copy, and "3/" against the third.* That may appear a trivial detail; yet, on the supposition that the pencil-marks are Wagner's — and they are infinitely more likely to be his than anyone else's—they may be instructive hereafter.

And now we come to the absolutely unforeseen. Fully to appreciate it, we must first remind ourselves that in the original version of '48, as also in the prose-draft that preceded it (the "Nibelungen Myth"—see *P.* VII.), the opera ended with a tableau representing the heroine, restored to her office of Valkyrie, leading Siegfried to Walhall. Her last words (apart from "Joy to thee, Grane: soon are we free!") had then been: "One only shall rule: All-father! thou in thy glory! Have joy of the freest of heroes! Siegfried I lead to thee: greet him right lovingly, the warrant of might everlasting!" Those lines are reproduced on this fair copy; but—the pen has struck them out, and to the right are written eight others, which I will literally translate before I quote them: "Blest atonement have I sighted for the high holy-eternal united [or "reconciled"] gods! Have ye joy of the freest of heroes! To divine brother-greeting thus leads him his bride!" The lines struck out, and the lines replacing them, I will now set side by side, as they stand on this fair copy:—

From 1848—struck out:	**Written in—1849:**
Nur Eine herrsche,	Selige Sühnung
Allvater, Herrliche, du!	ersah ich den hehren
Freue dich	heilig ewigen
des freiesten Helden!	einigen Goettern!
Siegfried führ' ich dir zu:	Freuet euch
biet' ihm minnlichen Gruss,	des freiesten Helden!
dem Bürgen ewiger Macht!	Göttlichem Brudergruss
	führt seine Braut ihn zu!

Before proceeding farther, I wish to lay stress on the fact that the left column above is a solitary instance of erasure, and thus

* It is an odd little fact, that in *Gtdg* the second song is worded quite differently from that in *Siegfried*, but reproduces the exact phraseology of the first song in the 1848-9 *S. Tod*, save for three words, "Falschen . . . Hort . . . erheben," which were originally represented by "Treulosen . . . Schatz . . . gewinnen" (cf. *G. Schr.* ii, 288). The first song alike in *Siegfried* and *Gtdg*, on the other hand, is worded precisely as the second of the '48-9 *Tod*, save for its first line, which has been transferred from the latter to the third

in itself suggests the lapse of a brief interval, were it only a week or a month; a lapse corroborated by the somewhat greater freedom of the handwriting to the right. Moreover a new idea, or rather, two new ideas begin to glimmer through this substitution, that of "atonement" and that of "brotherhood" with the gods. It therefore would seem that the substitution was made just after the *Jesus von Nazareth* scenario was sketched; let us say about the end of January or first week in February 1849, when Wagner (?) was writing the earlier of the two *Volksblätter* articles attributed to him, namely "Man and established Society" (*P.* VIII.).

If this "Selige Sühnung" variant begins to shake our preconceived notions of the benevolent *autocracy* assured to Wotan till the RING was planned, its pendant positively scatters them to the wind. For we have yet to take note of a marginal gloss; a gloss so hastily inscribed on this fair-copy that Herr Steiner at first attributed it to another hand, until careful collation with those facsimiles aforesaid convinced him of their common source. The closer you study this gloss, the firmer will root your conviction that none but Richard Wagner *could* have written it; whilst the fact of its handwriting being 'German' undoubtedly excludes it from his years of exile, as already shewn. Then compare it with the second of those *Volksblätter* articles, "The Revolution" (*P.* VIII.), and, allowing for some previous fermentation of the "atonement" concept, you will probably agree with me in ascribing this gloss to the very last weeks or days before the Dresden insurrection, namely to April 1849. Date-hunting, I admit, is very dry work; but the chief significance of this 'gloss' resides in the *earliness* of its anticipation of the eventual ending of the RING itself. By far the most important of all the revelations in the 1849 fair-copy, the following is its text, by side of which I set a rough translation :—

---

song of the two former; whilst that third song is identical in *all* the poems, with exception of its first line (of course) and the replacing of "wüssten wir . . . Gluth" by "wüsst' ich . . . Brunst." The date of the change in the wording of the bird's present *second* song, i.e. whether it was effected during its transference to *D. j. S.* in '51 or at the time of the general '52 revision, is one of those lesser riddles which I must leave to the explorer of minutiæ; but I must remind him that I am speaking of the literary editions (and ordinary textbook), as he will find a trifling variation in all three songs in the *Gtdg score.*

Machtlos scheidet,
die die Schuld nun meidet.
Eurer Schuld entspross der frohste Held,
dessen freier That sie getilgt:
erspart ist euch der bange Kampf
um eure endende Macht:
verblühet* in Wonne vor des Menschen That,
vor dem Helden, den ihr gezeugt!
Aus eurer bangen Furcht
verkünd' ich euch selige Todeserlösung!

Pass hence, [ye gods,]
forgone your guilty sway!
From your guilt has sprung the gladdest hero,
and his free deed has purged it:
spared are ye the dreaded war
to save your waning power:
fade out, rejoicing at the deed of Man,
before the hero whom ye bred!
Deliv'rance from dread I announce you,
the blessed redemption of Death!

An extraordinary change, from "ewige Macht" to "endende Macht" and "redemption by death"; yet scarcely more extraordinary than the sudden apparition of the concept of a guilt-laden deity. Not a word had the 1848 *S. Tod* contained about the gods' "Schuld"; their original sin is referred to only in the preliminary *prose*-draft, and that most ambiguous reference, as we now perceive, may well have been inserted there about this very date, since it is couched in practically the same words, "Zu dieser hohen Bestimmung, Tilger ihrer eigenen Schuld zu sein, erziehen nun die Götter den Menschen &c." (see vol. iii, 447).† Then take the "verblühet" [or "erbleichet"] in Wonne," of this gloss, how it anticipates the "weicht in Wonne der Gott" of p. 78 *Siegfried* and the "Ende in Wonne, du ewig Geschlecht" of p. 97! From whatever point of view we regard them, these ten marginal

* Herr Steiner reads this word as "erblühet," but that would scarcely make sense with the remainder. Should there clearly be no "v" in the word, I would suggest as an alternative "erbleichet," i.e. "expire."—A photograph would fix the letter, though there can be no doubt about the spirit.—As to the first two lines of the gloss, there is a possibility that they should be rendered "Powerless passes *she* hence, who avoids the guilt [of power]"; for the verbal inflection "*et*" is common to the third person singular and the second person plural, whilst the "*die*" is equally ambiguous. The balance of probability, however, when one takes into consideration the next word "Eurer," is in favour of the rendering given above.

† Nothing but an inspection of the manuscript of *Der Nibelungen-Mythus* could settle this point; but I should now opine that a whole block of sentences had been interpolated therein concurrently with the sketching of the 1849 'gloss.'

lines are the most pregnant in the whole fair-copy, since they graft upon the older stock a far more fruitful scion.

But again we are faced with a riddle. The earlier emendation, "Selige Sühnung . . . Brudergruss," where we have a "fraternity" concept quite in keeping with the "Allvaters freie Genossen" of the final chorus, is *not* in turn struck out. Which is it to be, for the present? A mere stroke of the pen could not determine the permanent adoption of the "Todeserlösung" gloss, as that would necessitate an entire recasting not only of Brünnhilde's, but also of Siegfried's last words, with omission of the final choruses; all of these passages being based on the assumption that hero and heroine ascend to the gods in Walhall. And the poem of *Der junge Siegfried*—as framed in the summer of 1851—to which of these terminations was it meant to be a prelude? The question *must* have been decided by then, at least provisionally. Can we imagine that, the "Todeserlösung" idea once started, it was abandoned by the time the poet conceived his new creation portraying "des Menschen That"? There the problem extends its scope till it cleaves the whole ground on which we had formerly relied for our notions of the part played by the Wanderer himself. And still more: if *D. j. Siegfried* was written with this "Todeserlösung" as its background, how could it be tacked to a *S. Tod* that was not, or not to be, far more radically altered in 1851 than ever it had been in 1849?

That is one side of the problem, or rather, the bare suggestion of one extensive side. There is another, for which I must ask your return to a consideration of the manuscript sent to Wigand for the purpose of publication in the Spring of 1850. How could it be *this* fair copy? Wagner loathed an "ossia," yet neither the one nor the other of the alternative passages is cancelled. True, a covering letter—and obviously there is at least one letter missing before No. 12 to Uhlig (June '50)—might have given instructions for such cancellation; but a crossing out by pen or pencil would have been a simpler mode. Again, after Wigand has declined the manuscript, Wagner tranquilly bids Uhlig keep it, as if it were a thing of no personal consequence; and Uhlig does keep it for a twelvemonth, during which the author is continually referring to his intention of setting the work to music. Even without knowledge of the contents of the '49 fair-copy, in vol. iii I pointed out that Wagner would necessarily require the original

of his *S. Tod* before he could set about its music: now that we know how much of the very first act had been altered on the fair-copy, that argument applies with double force to *it*. Those pencil-marks against the woodbird-songs, too—is it not clear that they were made as guide to the songs' transference to the nascent poem of *D. j. Siegfried*, i.e. before Uhlig had been so much as asked to return the Wigand manuscript? Finally, and this I hold conclusive, Letter 35 to Liszt (July '50) speaks of the latter MS. as containing a "brief preface" (see vol. iii, 222): the 1849 fair-copy is destitute of such a thing.—Look at it from whatever direction you please, you are forced to the conclusion that the "Wigand-Uhlig" and the "Sulzer" manuscripts are two separate documents, and consequently that we still have not reached the bottom of the matter. The 1849 fair-copy has told us much more than we had any reason to suspect: what may not that 1850 replica have in store for us, should it ever be recovered?

In its *original* state the 1850 replica might not afford much extra information; perhaps *less* than the '49 fair-copy, on which it was obviously based, as it would presumably omit that prophetic gloss. At anyrate the letter of July '50 to Liszt speaks of the poem as having been sent to Wigand "just as it is"; which we may reasonably interpret as implying that the idea embodied in that gloss had not been pursued to its legitimate results. Moreover, in the following September we found the author exulting over the voices available at Zurich for his chorus (iii, 227), and he would scarcely have laid such stress on that if the choral part were already cut down to its present dimensions. Then consider the circumstances in which he sent the manuscript away. It was in May 1850; i.e. just after he had come near to breaking with all his past and "fleeing into God-knows-what strange land." His friends the Ritters had joined him at Villeneuve, to woo him back to interest in life and art, and it is quite likely that young Karl himself wrote out the replica; but at such a time we can hardly imagine any radical alterations being made, even were they not excluded from probability by Wagner's subsequent indifference to its fate, as remarked last paragraph. We may fairly take it, then, that the original state of this 1850 replica was a mere reproduction of the 1849 fair copy itself, plus a brief prefatory note. But—Wagner redemanded it

immediately his '51 poem of *Young Siegfried* was finished, and the three questions which I put on p. 441 of vol. iii may now be safely answered in the affirmative. Naturally the replica of a '49 *Siegfried's Tod* differed from the '48 version; quite evidently it was needed as the basis of further alterations, if such were to be made while the final Dresden manuscript itself remained intact; and to Jakob Sulzer we might conclude that it was eventually given, if we simply reversed the halves of a statement one half whereof we have already proved erroneous as it stands:* a "copy with a few autograph alterations by the author" would tally precisely with what I suppose to have been the ultimate condition of this 1850 replica. And there we have a not unpromising clue to the present habitat of that replica: if *this* was what Sulzer surrendered to Wagner in Nov. 1866, for transmission to King Ludwig, may it not still be reposing in the private archives of the Bavarian Royal house? Should that be the case, we need not absolutely despair of its seeing the light again some day.

Wherever that 1850 replica may eventually be found, I believe that its discovery will answer all, or nearly all our Nibelungen riddles yet unsolved. I have already suggested that Wagner's reason for desiring its return in the summer of '51 was a wish to use it as substratum for changes necessitated in the *Tod* by the new aspect conferred on its story through the creation of *D. junge Siegfried.* Let me now denote the places where such changes do indeed appear to have been effected about this date; in other words, the indications of what I have called the "intermediate revision":—

First we have the omission of the "Rächer's Recht," or vendetta motive, from Siegfried's little speech to Gunther in act i, as the young Siegfried has not now gone forth to slay the sons of Hunding; a point to be taken in conjunction with the alteration of his long recital in act iii. The next point might be the Blood-brotherhood oath, where we distinctly have alike the strophic

* I may remark that for years before the manuscript was reclaimed by Wagner at the end of 1866, it had been preserved in the town-library at Winterthur, where Sulzer had deposited it for custody; but the Winterthur librarian also is dead.—P.S. On the point of going to press, I learn that in 1865 the aforesaid preface (or a draft thereof?) and two different MS. poems of *S. Tod* (which?) were in the keeping of M. Wesendonk.

construction of '51 and a poetic diction far less forcible than that of the accredited '52 changes. Compare this with the passage at the end of the fourth scene act ii; note that in both all reference to the gods is swept away—and you will presumably agree that these are changes directly proceeding from the non-venerating temper of the *younger* Siegfried, as emphasised in the *Communication* (*P.* I. 373). Here, of course, we can do no more than conjecture the date; but, should that conjecture point to '51, the "Blühenden Lebens" of this oath would throw much light upon the same expression at the drama's close; for which reason we will bear it in mind.—Of minor alterations in the scene at Gibich's Hof, the only one that need arrest us is the substitution of "Ein Zwillingspaar von Liebe bezwungen" (p. 16) for the "Von Wodan stammte Wälse, von dem ein Zwillingspaar" of the twofold Dresden version; a change that is perhaps more likely to date from '52 than from '51. For the other scenes of act i we have already accounted.

The close of act ii has lately revealed its secret. But what of its opening? In *Götterdämmerung* it differs almost in toto from the version common to the '48 and the '49 *S. Tod;* yet its present form can never have issued in its entirety from the period when the Gods' myth had acquired the "much *preciser* and more moving physiognomy" of 1852. In the earliest version (cf. *Ges. Schr.* ii) Alberich gives a long account of his welding of the ring from the stolen Rhinegold, the manufacture of the tarnhelm and the heaping of the hoard; his spoliation by the gods and giants, his curse bestowed on the ring, and the Norns' warning to Wodan; the impotence to which the giants' race had sunk, and Siegfried's slaying of the Worm and Mime. Certain lines have been bodily transferred from this account, obviously in '51, to the Wanderer's first scene in *Siegfried* (vid. pp. 36-7 ant.), whilst other ideas have clearly migrated to the Alberich-Wanderer scene of *Siegfried* act ii. The problem here is highly complicated, since the scene last named is one of those which Wagner specifically marked out for a '52 revision, and we cannot tell how much of its narrative portion may therefore have been dropped; yet if you realise that by the time of *D. j. Siegfried* Alberich's appearance in act ii of the *Tod* is no longer his first one, you will recognise the concurrent necessity of throwing his personal history back to the introductory drama, *D. j. S.*, part of it to act i

thereof, and part (much abridged or altered *later?*) to act ii. This would itself entail a recasting of the whole Alberich-Hagen scene of the *Tod* in 1851; and such a recasting, *followed* by retouches at the epoch of general revision in 1852, is positively the only hypothesis that will explain its present aspect. So complex is the problem involved in this scene, that it would demand a monograph apart; two or three of its more salient features, however, I may here survey:—

Its second and third lines, "Du schläfst, und hörst mich nicht, den Ruh' und Schlaf verrieth?"—even by stretching a metaphor to breaking point, is it possible to recognise in this expression the Alberich of *Rheingold?* Neither through "rest" nor through "sleep," but by superior cunning, was Alberich trapped; even the *S. Tod* of '48-9 had a more congruent reading, "den ruhlos Kummerreichen" ("the restless griever"). Here we indubitably have an indication akin to those in the Wanderer-Mime and Alberich-Mime scenes of *Siegfried*, namely of a distinctively '51 conception of the stratagem by which the dwarf was robbed.—"Wotan, der wüthende Räuber," on the other hand, shews the vigorous stroke of '52, as also does "Wotan's Speer *zerspellte* der Wälsung." But few lines lower, and we come to the incomprehensible "Walhall und *Nibelheim* neigen sich ihm," paralleled in act i (p. 17) by the *survival* from the earliest poem, "Knecht sind die Niblungen ihm"; a survival quite as much out of touch with the present plot, as is the occasional recrudescence of "*Der* Niblungen Hort" in lieu of "Des."—"Lachend in liebender Brunst brennt er lebend dahin," and probably the four preceding lines, would again belong to '52; but the next speech of Alberich's contains an amazing suggestion: "Ein weises Weib lebt dem Wälsung zu Lieb': rieth sie ihm je des Rheines Töchtern . . . zurück zu geben den Ring." Since Alberich had kept such close watch on the fate of his ring, he must have been aware that it had already been given to the "weises Weib" and wrested back from her by "the Wälsung"; that all possibility of Brynhild's tendering "advice" to Siegfried, or of his accepting it, had been doubly extinguished; and that she herself must now be harbouring equal enmity with the dwarf against the ring's latest despoiler: if we do not credit Alberich himself with so precise an art of divination, still Hagen would surely not have left him entirely in the dark as to the present condition of affairs. Neither with the original story, nor with its

ultimate fashioning, would this part of the Alberich-Hagen scene comport. What can be the meaning of it? Can it possibly have been devised, at the intermediate epoch, to form the opening of act *one*, or even to replace the Norns' scene? In any case it is of immense interest, as it shews that the poet may once have fugitively entertained the thought of ending his *Young Siegfried* with the adoption of similar "advice" (a "world-redeeming deed," as prophesied to or by the Wala), and thus of making that one work a drama complete in itself. The thought has survived, but in bewildering surroundings. A singular paradox; puzzling enough on the simple hypothesis that it was overlooked in '52, but perfectly impossible to have been deliberately engendered then.

Yet another point in act ii that bears on the Gods' myth. Already in the prologue to act i there lies a curious inconsistency: in the '48 and '49 versions Brynhild's last words to Siegfried had been "Heil, Wonne der Götter!"; these are now cancelled ('51 or '52?), yet her "O heilige Götter, hehre Geschlechter, weidet eu'r Aug' an dem weihvollen Paar!" are allowed to remain. Much the same occurs just after Siegfried's denial of her: save for a neutral word or two, the heroine calls on the gods to inspire her with vengeance ("Heilige Götter, himmlische Lenker!" &c.) in precisely the same terms in all the versions; yet when it comes to the spear-oath, her original invocation to Fricka very rightly disappears. So does Siegfried's to Wotan, however; and perhaps that may help to date the alteration, on our former assumption of the forest-youth who reveres no Being above himself. At anyrate, though the first half of the oath is as finely expressed as the work of '52, we have the 'strophic' form of '51 in evidence again.

Coming to act iii, in the first scene we have Wellgunde now speaking merely of "Ein gold'ner Ring" (*Gtdg* p. 65) where the earlier version, of '48-9, had "Ein kleines Ringlein" ("a wee ring"): at what date this minor change was made, is immaterial; but the fact of the ring's having originally been conceived as *small*, will explain the necessity for Brünnhilde to stagger into Siegfried's arms in act ii, in order that she may recognise it when he stretches out his finger. Immediately after this tiny variant, however, we have a strange survival from the earliest readings, "Einen Riesenwurm erschlug ich *um* den Ring": *our* young Siegfried knew nothing of the ring till he had tasted the dead monster's blood.

There are other survivals, also, that betray a wider acquaintance with the attractions and importunities of womankind, on the hero's part, than quite harmonises with the present plot. But these are trifles. The important passage is his answer to the nixies' solemn warning:—

"Mein Schwert *zerschwang* einen Speer" is plainly of '52, not only on the evidence of that strong word in it, but also because of its upsetting the balance of the subsequent strophes, each of which begins with a group of short lines—the favourite model in '51. At the other end of the speech we find four (longer) lines from the '48-9 version expanded into ten; and the new matter here, the three lines "sollt' ohne Lieb' in der *Furcht* Bande bang ich sie fesseln," imports the specifically '51 idea of Siegfried's fearlessness. Still more pronouncedly of '51 origin are the verses toward the opening of this speech, "Wohl warnte mich einst vor dem Fluch ein Wurm, doch das Fürchten lehrt' er mich nicht" (cf. *Siegfried* pp. 57 and 59), and for the same reason. Their continuation, "Der Welt Erbe gewann mir ein Ring," must also date from '51, for it is at variance with the whole later conception of the hero's character; in any case it cannot have been written *after* Alberich's "denn nicht kennt er des Ringes Werth" (act ii, p. 40), and thus, though absent from the earliest reading, it may be classed with the above-mentioned survival of "erschlug ich um den Ring." *

In the scene with Gunther and his hunting retinue, the slight alteration of "lass' das *den Göttern* Labsal sein" into "der Mutter Erde lass' das ein Labsal sein" probably dates from '51, together with prior obliterations of Siegfried's remnants of religious faith. But the absolutely imperative change, here, would be that to be made in his long narration, to bring it into line with *D. j. Siegfried.* The original version of *S. Tod* spun the first part of the hero's narrative, the part preceding "Von des Wurmes Blut," to more than twice its length in *Gtdg;* there we had details of his parentage, as well as of his education, his splitting of the anvil,

* Conversely I should be disposed to assign Siegfried's "Was ihr mir nützet weiss ich nicht" (*Siegfried* p. 64) to the '52 revision, as the bird had informed him but four pages previously that the ring would make him "Walter der Welt." The strophic *form* here is certainly of '51; but the (presumable) change of contents offers a curious predicament, seeing how eager the lad had shewn himself in act i to get into "the world."

and—his vendetta wreaked on the Hundings before his fight with the Worm. That vendetta motive, as I remarked when discussing act i, was bound to disappear if 'the two Siegfrieds' were ever to be performed in conjunction. And now, if you examine this part of the recital in its final form, you will recognise a style of diction distinctly resembling that of the undoubtedly original reaches of *Siegfried* (the bulk of act i, e.g.), far less drastic, pithy, numismatic, if I may use the term, than that of *Rheingold* or the Waltraute scene; and once again we have the strophic construction, a perfect specimen thereof—six short lines of 2 main accents each, followed by two longer lines of 3 main accents each, and the whole group repeated twice. Were this the sole internal evidence in all the work, it would attest our 'intermediate revision' beyond all doubt.—The rest of the narrative need not delay us; it differs from the earliest version chiefly in the order of the woodbird-songs (49-50, 54 *ant.*) and the relief afforded to the principal singer through a few more interruptions by Hagen and the clansmen. One little touch, however, should not be neglected: "*In Leid* zum Wipfel lauscht' ich hinauf," says Siegfried in the final form; as, apart from his "Sterben die Menschenmütter" etc. in *Siegfried* (p. 54), it is the only indication of a capacity for *grief* in all his rôle, it has its value. It did not exist in the only other *Tods* we know at present; probably it is of '51 (see the *Eroica* programme, *P.* III. 221), but the clue is too slender to follow.

Siegfried's Death-scene. In the *Tod* of '48-9 this was almost directly preceded by Hagen's interpretation of the ravens' augury, "Sie eilen, Wodan dich zu melden" ("They haste to announce thee to Wodan"), now cancelled. That confronts us at once with our former question: Was the purport of the "*Machtlos*" gloss of 1849 adopted by the time *D. j. Siegfried* was written? Surely it must have been: the poet could never have taken a retrograde step when he arrived at his first great extension of the myth. But if the closing apotheosis of the *Tod* were already mentally discarded, those words of Hagen's must necessarily vanish in 1851; and more than they. "Du strahlendes Wodanskind! . . . nach Walhall weise mich nun,—dass zu aller Helden Ehre Allvaters Meth ich trinke," still said the dying hero in the manuscript of '49. All that has gone, and in 1851 must at least have been earmarked for erasure. Was the present speech then substituted for the old one? Scarcely in its entirety, I should

judge, though the strophic form suggests a '51 foundation. Just five lines of it have an air of that period: "wer band dich in Schlummer so bang? . . . und aber der Braut bricht er die Bande:—da lacht ihm Brünnhilde's Lust . . . Brünnhild' bietet mir—Gruss!" The "Wer verschloss dich wieder in Schlaf?" hovers on the boundary, and may belong to either epoch; but the remainder of this dying speech is a perfect jewel of poetry, one of Wagner's finest inspirations, and I doubt that even he could have risen to it before the whole RING lay behind him.

If the hero's death-scene required amendment after adoption of the root-idea of that marginal gloss, still more so the heroine's long parting monologue. "Hab' Dank nun, Hagen! Wie ich dich hiess, wo ich dich's wies, hast du für Wodan ihn gezeichnet, —zu dem ich nun mit ihm ziehe" ("I thank thee, Hagen! As I bade thee, where I shewed thee, hast thou for Wodan marked him out,—to whom with him I fare now")—these lines, unerased on the fair-copy despite its gloss, could never remain if aught were to be seriously done with the work. The old figurative address to the Nibelungen, "eure Knechtschaft künd' ich auf," might pass perhaps, as we have seen their "thraldom" perpetuated even in *D. j. S.*; but one change would probably lead to several others. And ex hypothesi the closing words and final tableau were bound to be revised.

I have not forgotten that so late as mid-November '52, i.e. but a few weeks before the whole Ring-poem stood complete, Wagner told Uhlig that he had three scenes to re-write entirely ("*ganz neu zu dichten*"), namely the Norns', the Valkyries' (now Waltraute), and "above all the close also"; but the two other scenes *are* entirely new now, whereas one-third of this close consists of lines derived either word for word, or with but the slightest alteration, from the very earliest version. An instance of the mode of adaptation may prove instructive:—In the '48-9 version Brünnhilde's monologue commenced with "O, er war rein!—Treuer als von ihm wurden Eide nie gewahrt: dem Freunde treu, von der eig'nen Trauten schied er sich durch sein Schwert." I will italicise the variations in the final form of the parallel passage: "*der* rein*ste* war er, *der mich verrieth! Die Gattin trügend*—treu dem Freunde—von der eig'nen Trauten—*einzig ihm theuer*—schied er sich durch sein Schwert.—*Aechter als er schwur keiner* Eide; treuer als *er*" &c. (here we pass to new

matter). It is a little curious to observe how the revision, at whatever date effected, has dovetailed new lines with the old; and what here is *proved*, may not unreasonably be surmised in other cases, where we have no such easy access to the original substratum. But the point immediately concerning us is this: the monologue *not* having been entirely rewritten in '52, may it not still shew traces of our hypothetic '51 revision, side by side with its demonstrable vestiges of '48?

In the first place we should remark its frequent and sudden flights from one train of thought to another. Beyond doubt, this characteristic offers the musician unrivalled opportunities for richness of thematic combination; but, speaking of the text alone, if you compare it with Isolde's last rhapsody, you will be struck by the difference between that which springs from one gust of inspiration, and that which is compact of heterogeneous elements. With its majesty of thematic material, and its marvels of orchestration, we rather seem to feel and see the import of the heroine's message; but, viewed as poetry of thought and word, except in parts, this final address of Brynhild's will neither bear the comparison suggested, nor yet with Waltraute's recital. Of course the situation is entirely different, as Brynhild has to gather into her hands the threads of an infinitely more intricate plot; yet the Richard Wagner of 1852 would have poured forth his ideas far more in one continuous flow, had he really re-written, instead of retouching this close.

As the author's own arrangement invites to some freedom, I will choose for my second point the heroine's thanks to the Rhinedaughters for their "candid advice" about the ring: "euch dank' ich redlichen Rath." From the first version onward, it is to be assumed that Brynhild's nocturnal expedition to the river is meant to suggest that the water-nixies fulfil behind the scene their intention expressed to Siegfried, "Zu ihr!" Yet the *original* speech explicitly referred, not to their, but to "Der *Nornen* Rath," as that which the heroine was following with regard to the ring. The Norns vanishing from the text, in '51 it would be quite reasonable to refer to this deducible "advice" of the Rhinedaughters, in fact to speak of it as an urgent request, "was ihr begehrt"; but in '52 we ourselves have witnessed a most pregnant scene, in which Waltraute brings the same counsel from Wotan himself, from father to daughter. Surely the dramatist of

'52 would have connected the idea with what had passed before our eyes, rather than with what is remotely hinted to our imagination. Here, then, we have the strongest symptom of an intermediate revision; and if you omit the unmistakably '52 "Verfluchter Reif! furchtbarer Ring! dein Gold fass' ich und geb' es nun fort," there stands before you a perfectly balanced group of three *strophes*, from "Mein Erbe nun" to "der zum Unheil euch geraubt," the majority of the lines whereof have merely been slightly transposed from their oldest collocation.

The mystical "Wisst ihr wie das ward?" and "Weiss ich nun was dir frommt?" are interjections directly borrowed in the one case, adapted in the other, from the Norns' scene, therefore indubitably of '52. But between them stands a passage distinctly savouring of an earlier period, the period at which I assume the '49 gloss to have reasserted itself; for we have that "Schuld" made use of, and in a fashion such as the Brynhild of *Die Walküre* would scarcely have employed.* This is almost a revengeful accusation against Wotan, charging him with direct responsibility for a catastrophe which he had done his utmost to prevent, and femininely oblivious to the heroine's own share in the course of events (from the saving of Sieglinde onward). It cannot have been added after the Gods'-myth had acquired so "much more affecting a physiognomy." The first two lines, "O ihr, der Eide heilige Hüter," take us back in fact to the associations of the earliest version: can they possibly have figured in the 1850 replica itself?—Contrast the whole passage with the next one, "Alles! Alles . . . Ruhe, du Gott!" Here we have at last the voice of truest sympathy, of the compassionate daughter of '52.

To '52 I should also attribute the "Fliegt heim, ihr Raben . . . Walhall's prangende Burg," and from "Grane, mein Ross" to the speech's end. But the intervening passage, that has not been set to music, bears tokens of two different periods. From

* The position of the last three lines of this passage, "mich—musste der Reinste verrathen, dass wissend würde ein Weib," is almost as incomprehensible as their contents. Something *must* have been omitted here, something that preceded them in '51. They form no part of the '48-9 version; but the last of them does resemble that "wachend wirkt dein wissendes Kind" of the Wanderer-Wala scene in *Siegfried*, which would rather appear to belong to '51.

"Nicht Gut, nicht Gold," it has the ring and swing of '52 work, though a similar idea may have previously been conveyed in other words; but even the "lass' ohne Walter die Welt ich zurück" seems to be a '51 surrogate for the "endende Macht" of the gloss, and may help us to a still preciser date (see next par.). As for the fourteen verses, "Ihr, blühenden Lebens bleibend Geschlecht" &c., nothing but the most unequivocal ocular demonstration could convince me that they were written with a pen that had just indited "Mit stummem Wink Walhall's Edle wies er zum Forst, die Welt-Esche zu fällen." See how flat falls "was ich nun euch melde, merket es wohl," compared with Waltraute's "Höre mit Sinn was ich sage"; it is a weakened repetition of Siegfried's "Jetzt aber merkt wohl auf die Mär': Wunder muss ich euch melden" (p. 73), which also I assign to '51. And the "blühenden Lebens" we have already encountered in the blood-brotherhood oath, which there were other grounds for supposing to have been altered in that intermediate year. That, directly after announcing the end of Walhall and its inmates to Wotan, Brynhild should turn to lecture little people with whom she had never exchanged a word, and who had never entered her reckoning before; that she should impress upon bystanders what they were about to see, and what it meant—that can never have been integral work of the dramatist of the RING DES NIBELUNGEN, —and eventually the *Ring-musician* discarded it.

The antiphonal choruses of the '48-9 version needed but a cross to cancel them, while the closing tableau merely cuts Alberich out, and substitutes "a glow like the Northern Lights" for the original apotheosis of hero and heroine. Such easy changes may have been effected either in '51 or '52; but as they would naturally follow on Brynhild's "Nach Norden dann blickt durch die Nacht! Erglänzt dort am Himmel ein heiliges Glühen" &c., her "lass ohne Walter die Welt ich zurück" shall now be probed for the closer date of our assumed 'intermediate revision.'

Please turn back to p. 253 of vol. iii, and you will find Wagner telling Uhlig in November '51: "With my work [the projected tetralogy] I give to sons and daughters of Revolution the noblest meaning of that revolution." No more than "the two Siegfrieds" having been written as yet, and no hint being now given him of a change in their aim, this plainly pre-assumes acquaintance on Uhlig's part with a tendency already existing in that pair of

works. Evidently, at least the intention to give a "revolutionary" direction to the closing scene had been divulged when Uhlig visited Zurich in the summer just past; perhaps the author had gone still farther, and jotted several emendations on his regained spare copy of the *Tod* before his friend's visit was over. In any case he had two fallow months at the hydropathic 'cure'-house from the middle of September to the date of the letter just cited, and during those two months we have seen the Siegfried subject constantly in the forefront of his thoughts; in fact he connects it in a letter of Oct. 22 with the same idea as that "Menschen That" of the gloss: "My Weimar Siegfried is becoming more and more problematic—not so the Siegfried itself; for thus much is certain: I shall devote myself to nothing but Art in future, unless it be a little downright Humanism (*Menschenthum*)." In the seclusion of Albisbrunn, accordingly, we may picture the poet noting down his alterations of the *Tod* whenever time hung heavy on his hands, to prepare it for future musical composition together with its younger brother—until that very occupation at last engendered in his brain a project which should at once double the compass of his work and deepen it to infinity. From this surmised interim revision of *Siegfried's Tod* in Sept.-Oct. '51, and more especially from a dissection of the Alberich-Hagen scene, may thus have sprung the vast tetralogy itself.

Perhaps the reader will be relieved to find this lengthy chapter drawing to a close—he cannot feel more relieved than myself—since it has been chiefly occupied with a discussion of what I may best compare to 'faults' in geologic strata. To the geologist such faults, however, are of inestimable value, revealing the secret of all the forces once at work; and it is with just his dispassionate eye that we should regard them, not as disfiguring the landscape, but as adding to it a cosmic interest. Thus have I attempted to afford at least a skeleton key to certain riddles, some whereof I have so often heard asked in private that I feel sure there are hundreds of inquirers who would welcome such an aid. Not on every conclusion ventured above would I stake my existence, since we still are handicapped by two unknown quantities, namely the original manuscript of *D. j. Siegfried*, and that assumedly retouched replica of the *Tod*. But if I shall have spurred even two or three true scholars to investigate the

real difficulties in the text of the last two members of the RING, instead of leaving them at the mercy of the half-informed reporter and the effusive amateur, my labour will not have been in vain. It is high time that we looked these things squarely in the face, instead of worrying at "interpretations" that fain would turn the living drama into a platitudinous allegory or an abstruse philosophical system. The Ring-poem grew and grew, and grew 'out of' its former self at points, as the characters took on a sharper individuality in the poet's mind. What wonder that a poem covering the four most actively evolutionary years in its author's life should betray a minor incoherence here and there? And still less wonder when we recollect the circumstances in which it was submitted to the final file—worry, ill-health and deep sorrow.

Hear what has recently been said, and that by a most competent authority,* about the only work in German literature with which this poem can be compared: "Since 1887 we possess the so-called 'Ur-Faust.' There we have Goethe's homogeneous youthful style throughout. But would we exchange for it the mature Part I. of *Faust?* In the finished *Faust* we recognise at least as great, as irreconcilable diversities of style as in the new *Tannhäuser.* The researcher, perhaps also the sensitive layman, remarks at once where the riper Goethe takes up the word, beside or after the young storm-and-stresser. In fact, quite new ideas, at variance with the first draft, appear in the plot. And yet *Faust* I. remains our stand-by." Replace "new Tannhäuser" by "two Siegfrieds," and you will find them in the best of company. Perfection of every detail is possible only in works of smaller scale: I am not even sure that it is desirable in colossal products, lest they quite overwhelm us. The final polish often brings a sense of chill, whereas the occasional 'fault' seems just to give that "touch of nature" which "makes the whole world kin."

---

* Dr Wolfgang Golther, in an article collating the older *Tannhäuser* with its revision for Paris 1860-1: *Die Musik*, May 1903, p. 282.

II.

THE GREAT POEM READ.

Reason why the Ring *was printed privately. Its prefatory note. Distribution of copies.—Wagner reads it aloud at Zurich; protests against recital by others.—Opinions of its readers: Liszt, Stahr, Köhler, Schopenhauer, Keller.—Roeckel's objections replied to; a warning against 'inner meanings.'—Brynhild's farewell verses once again.*

> *A* littérateur *can never comprehend me; it needs a whole man or true artist.*
>
> R. Wagner (Apr. 1853).

We have been dealing at considerable length with the first edition of the Ring-poem, but have not yet learnt why it was printed privately.

On the 2nd of July 1852, the day after completing the poem of *Die Walküre*, Wagner writes Uhlig: "Were you here, I'd read the piece to you this day; but I shall probably not arrive at a disposable copy yet awhile, as I'm rather severely knocked up again: I really work too furiously.—For that matter, now the whole big poem is nearing completion, the question arises whether I might not like to make my friends acquainted with it sooner than would be possible if I waited to round off all its music first. I feel as if I couldn't endure keeping it all to myself so long as that. I can't possibly make it over to the printer at present, though: to put already in the smirching hands of our dirty Criticism a thing that in truth is but half finished—pending completion of the composition—would be a sin against myself. With my actual friends it is different, as their sympathy could but help and stimulate my labour. So I have hit on the notion of getting 25 to 30 copies of the entire poem lithographed, to send to carefully selected friends. Unfortunately it presents the same old

drawback, that I, poor beast, shall have to play the 'munificent' again; for how could I possibly allow these copies to be paid me? It could only be thought of, were a number of my friends to approach me with the request to lend them the manuscript for reduplication, and subscribe together to defray the cost. You see how exceptional everything is with wretched bungling me!"

With typical impetuousness, no sooner is the project conceived, than steps are taken toward its carrying out—apart from any subscription. For a letter of three weeks later tells Uhlig: "I inquired of Härtels about the manifolding of the manuscript of the Nibelungen dramas, and they have answered me that they would esteem it a very great pleasure and honour if I would commit the publication of these works to them, when the time came: I was to think of no one else meanwhile, but only them.—There'll be time enough for that" (July 22, '52). *Publication* of the poem, however, was not what the author then proposed. Härtels were just issuing the full score of *Lohengrin*, as we saw last volume; "when the time came" for publishing that of the RING, they were otherwise minded, as we shall learn in due course.

How far from groundless were Wagner's fears of a besmirching of his Ring-poem by "our dirty Criticism," we may gather from the next reference. Aug. 9, '52, again to Uhlig: "I wish you would take the next opportunity to let our friends have a couple of lines begging them to be a little more careful in lending my manuscript of Young Siegfried: the other day I found that the Kreuzzeitung had already got hold of a joke about the Lindwurm Fafner!—Such experiences put me quite out of conceit with my proposal to distribute copies of the entire poem among my friends." The context proves that Weimar was the suspected channel, and within a day or two an inquiry must have been directed thither,* for Liszt writes Wagner on the 23rd, with just a shade of irritation: "Whatever can have possessed you to trouble your head with the silly jokes set afloat in a couple of newspapers, and even to accuse myself of having given occasion to them? The latter is unthinkable, and Hans will

* Most probably by Uhlig to young Bülow; with less likelihood by Wagner himself in that letter which I have already shewn (vol. iii, 379 *n*) to be missing from the *Correspondence*.

have told you already that the manuscript of Siegfried has not left his hands for months.* Previously I had lent it solely to Frl. Frommann, at your request; whereas the reading at Zigesar's for the Herv Grand Duke, at the beginning of last year,† could scarcely have been the origin of the Kreuzzeitung's facetiæ. For that matter, the quip is quite harmless and without importance, and I beseech you once for all to ignore that kind of tittle-tattle altogether.—What is it to you, if other people make fools of themselves about you and your works? As the French proverb says, you decidedly have *d'autres chats à fouetter!* So, for your own sake and mine, don't let anything deter you from printing and publishing the Nibelungen tetralogy as soon as you have finished it. Härtel spoke to me about your letter in this regard some 2 months back, and in my opinion you can do nothing more opportune, than to make your poem over to the public prior to finishing the score. . . . Write your score as quickly as you can, and meantime let the poem appear at Härtel's, or elsewhere, as its harbinger. . . . Farewell, at peace with yourself, and publish your Nibelungen poem soon, to prepare and predispose the public. Leave all Grenzbotens, Wohlbekannten,‡ Kreuzzeitungs and Gazette-musicales completely on one side, and don't worry about such stuff and nonsense. Rather drink a bottle of good wine—and work your way on, and up, to eternal immortality."

The tail of the advice is far better than its body, which, however well meant, betrays a total inability to grasp the case. Had

---

* Hans would seem to have made a copy for himself, however, for he writes a certain Dr Piwko of Danzig, Sept. 18, '55: "I hope Herr Heinrich Behrend [also of Danzig] has lent you the manuscript of Wagner's 'young Siegfried,' as I asked him." It being highly improbable that Liszt had made over his copy to von Bülow, this would represent at least a third transcript (the first having been given to Frau Ritter), or a fourth if we suppose Uhlig also to have taken one. Under these conditions, discovery of the original text is not to be despaired of.—P.S. In 1865 Frau Wesendonk possessed alike "draft" and MS. poem (original?); *cf* 55*n sup.* and 300 *inf.*

† Liszt's chronometry is much at fault again; according to his letter of January, the reading must have taken place either at the *end* of "last year" or within the first fortnight of '52.

‡ J. C. Lobe, at this time a Leipzig professor, but formerly of Weimar. His "Briefe eines Wohlbekannten" were directed against the new musical tendency.

Wagner for a moment thought of making his poem public property at the present juncture, the *Kreuzzeitung's* quip was a providential warning. There was very real danger of so unparalleled a poem as the RING DES NIBELUNGEN being scoffed to death in the Bœotian German 'fifties; which conceivably might have so disheartened its author, as to make him throw its music over in disgust. Still greater danger was there of the subject being annexed, under a colourable disguise, by some unscrupulous rival; the mere title sufficed to cause the Berlin Kapellmeister Dorn to forestall its author with a *Nibelungen* opera before another year was out.*

For every consideration Wagner was right in desiring to confine his great poem to the circle of his friends and well-wishers for some years to come. Early in 1853 accordingly he had but fifty copies of it printed, and on the 11th of February we have seen him despatching the first parcel to Liszt. A word or two about the outward form.

The 1853 issue figures as a brochure of 160 pages, demy octavo; "not to be obtained through the book-trade, but printed privately for friends, on superb thick paper, and neatly got up," so Schopenhauer describes it to Frauenstädt after receiving a complimentary copy at the end of 1854—of which more anon. The type is 'Roman,' save for the stage-directions etc., which are given in italics and without brackets. The so-called 'bastard title' on page 1 is just "DER RING DES NIBELUNGEN." Page 2 bears a prefatory note, the style whereof bears witness to the mental fatigue already noted, and stands in crying contrast to the conciseness of diction of the work it ushers in:—

---

* Produced by Liszt himself in the Weimar theatre at the beginning of 1854; the weakest possible sop to Cerberus (see cap. VII.).—No other operatist, indeed, attempted to compete; but there can be little doubt that Geibel's *Brunhild* drama (1857), the dramatic poet Hebbel's *Nibelungen* trilogy (produced Weimar 1861), and Jordan's alliterative *Sigfried* epos (pub. 1868, but "rhapsodised" by the author for several years previously)—to say nothing of a host of feebler products—all owed their inspiration to at least second-hand knowledge of the work which was destined to eclipse them all, the RING poem of Richard Wagner. For an instructive account of this parasitic outcrop I must refer the curious to Herr Glasenapp's group of articles on the "Deutscher Dichterwald" in the *Bayreuther Blätter* of 1880, where we learn how other of Wagner's texts, and more particularly his *Tristan*, were also preyed on.

For sake of a confidential communication to friends, and to others among whom I may presuppose a special interest in the subject, I have had a small number of copies of the accompanying poem printed at my own expense. Consequently, if I distribute the same to comparative strangers, it is with the object of acquainting them also with a project for whose execution I shall need a lengthy term of years, besides the most exceptionally favourable circumstances; since this project of mine, by the very nature of the thing, can be realised only when my present work of poetry shall be carried out in music and portrayed upon the stage. My own mind is clear as to both possibilities of execution—even that of the scenic representation having been carefully weighed in the scales of my experience, though it would certainly require a hitherto-lacking co-operation of artistic forces latently extant indeed, but now in a state of dispersal and as yet untrained for such a task. In these conditions it will be manifest that the present communication of my work of poetry—the sketch, in a sense, for that intended work of active art—can in nowise be reckoned for publicity; for which reason, moreover, I have declined the offer of a public issue [Härtel's], whatever other advantages it might have had for me. On the contrary, as it is easily imaginable that an accident might bring this book between the hands of some busybody, who, mistaking its destination, should regard it in the light of a frankly literary product, and feel called to drag it into literary publicity, I consider myself entitled to put my friends on their guard against any such attempt.*

RICHARD WAGNER.

As, even in the above inelegant translation, regard for clearness has compelled me to omit a subsidiary clause or two of the original, I will reproduce the German of this rare historic document for the benefit of those conversant with that tongue:—

Zu dem Zwecke einer vertrauten Mittheilung an Freunde, und solche, bei denen ich eine besondre Theilnahme an dem Gegenstande voraussetzen darf, liess ich von der vorliegenden Dichtung eine geringe Anzahl von Exemplaren durch Satz und Druck auf meine Kosten herstellen. Demnach erziele ich durch die Vertheilung derselben an Entfernte, diese zu Mitwissern eines Vorhabens zu machen, zu dessen Ausführung ich einer grösseren Reihe von Jahren, sowie der ausserordentlichsten Mithülfe besonders günstiger Umstände bedarf, da dieses Vorhaben, meiner Absicht, wie der Natur der Sache nach, erst

* Still further to emphasise the warning, on the complimentary copy aforesaid, and presumably on others, a line is drawn by side thereof in ink; evidently by the author, as its colour is the same as that of the autograph dedication.

dann verwirklicht sein kann, wenn mein hier mitgetheiltes Dichterwerk musikalisch ausgeführt, und scenisch dargestellt ist. Bin ich mir nun wohl über beide Möglichkeiten der Ausführung klar, und habe ich selbst auch die der scenischen Darstellung—allerdings nur durch ein bisher noch nicht da gewesenes Zusammenwirken jetzt zerstreuter, und für diesen Zweck noch ungeübter, dennoch aber der Anlage nach vorhandener, künstlerischer Kräfte—meiner Erfahrung gemäss genau erwogen : so sieht doch jeder, der den bezeichneten Charakter meines Vorhabens erkennt, ein, dass die Mittheilung meines Dichterwerkes—gleichsam des Entwurfes zu jenem beabsichtigten wirklichen Kunstwerke—jetzt in keiner Weise für die Oeffentlichkeit berechnet sein kann, wesshalb ich auch das Anerbieten einer öffentlichen Herausgabe, welche Vortheile sie mir sonst auch gewährt hätte, von mir wies. Sollte dagegen ein leicht denkbarer Zufall dieses Buch einem Unberufenen in die Hände führen, der, die Bestimmung desselben verkennend, es schlechthin für ein literarisches Produkt hielte, und sich gemüssigt fühlte, auf irgend eine Weise es vor die literarische Oeffentlichkeit zu ziehen, so erachte ich mich daher im Rechte, wenn ich ein solches Beginnen der gebührenden Beachtung meiner Freunde empfehle.

RICHARD WAGNER.

So much for the unique page 2 of the 1853 issue. Page 3 gives the work's full title, "DER RING DES NIBELUNGEN. Ein Bühnenfestspiel für drei Tage und einen Vorabend," the same as used in all the *author's* editions, though the textbooks persistently style it a "trilogie." The word "trilogy" no doubt is handier than "tetralogy," and for literary convenience either will equally well describe the group of dramas; but assuredly the author's distinctive sub-title, "A stage-festival-play for three days and a fore-evening," should be preserved on anything so formal as the title-page to his text.

Page 4 bears nothing but the printer's imprint, "Druck von E. Kiesling," presumably a Zurich firm. Page 5 displays the titles of the several parts: "Vorabend: Das Rheingold.—Erster Tag: Die Walküre.—Zweiter Tag: Der junge Siegfried.—Dritter Tag: Siegfried's Tod." Page 6 is blank. With page 7 the actual poem begins: under a repetition of the specific title "Fore-evening: The Rheingold" we have first the list of dramatis personæ (in which the only difference from subsequent editions *

* In all the author's editions, from that of 1853 to the full score, the two Nibelungen, Alberich and Mime, are ranged *before* the Giants; the textbooks arbitrarily reverse the order.

is the spelling of "Wotan" with a "d"), and then the text itself in double columns. The other three members, of course, follow suit.

Occasional variations from the ultimate text having already been discussed, we now know as much as we need concerning both the outer and the inner form of the first edition of the RING, and may return to the parcel despatched on February 11 to Liszt.

Ten copies in all, does Liszt receive, a fifth of the edition. Three of these are dressed in the glory of a "binding de luxe": the first of them Liszt is to keep for himself; the second he is to present to Maria Paulowna,* with the assurance that, whatever else in it may not quite meet with her approval, "never has *Woman* received such a glorification" as in this poem; the third to her daughter, the Princess of Prussia (subsequently Kaiserin Augusta). So, through the irony of circumstances, the work "for sons and daughters of Revolution" makes its first bow at a Court, just as it will eventually make its first public appearance before a "Parterre of Princes." A more plebeian destiny awaits the other seven copies, those in workaday get-up, though von Zigesar, the Weimar Intendant, is to have the first of them. Young Bülow is to retain one for himself, and send another to the Waldheim prisoner "my poor friend Roeckel"; Franz Müller and Alwine Frommann (reader to the Pss of Prussia) are to have one apiece; whilst the remaining two are to be lent at discretion, more particularly remembering the literary democrat, Adolf Stahr. A further supply may be had for the asking, "if you think you can dispose of a few copies where they will be appreciated;" to which Liszt replies by immediately asking for three more.

Dresden receives its consignment, for Frau Julie and her son Karl Ritter, Dr Pusinelli, F. Heine and old Fischer, and perhaps one or two more. Zurich would absorb another half-score or so, what with Herwegh, Sulzer, Baumgartner, Spyri, Alex. Müller, Ettmüller, the Wesendonks, the Willes, and so on. Considerably

* Practical as ever: "Luckily I have been able to get type-setting, printing and binding, all done in the nick of time for you to present this copy on the sixteenth. . . . Tell the Gd Duchess that I had word she was unwell, and there was little prospect of her appearing in public on her birthday: as that would prevent her hearing the Flying Dutchman at the theatre, may it please her to cast a glance on this my latest work instead."

more than half the tiny edition must thus have melted away at once, and seven years hence we shall find the author without so much as a single copy at disposal for his own purposes.*

While the various recipients are feasting or otherwise on their free gifts, we will listen to what there is to tell about a couple of vivâ voce readings by the poet himself. For the first, Frau Wille is our meagre reporter: "It was about Christmas 1852 that the gigantic poem of the Nibelungen trilogy was read for the first time at Mariafeld. Wagner read it on three evenings, and it lasted well into the night. With the addition of the prologue 'Rheingold,' he afterwards regaled an admiring circle with his work in the large salon of the Hotel Baur at Zurich. On the last evening of the recital at our house I put Wagner out of humour by leaving the room while he was reading. My little boy was feverish, and had asked for me. When I appeared next morning, Wagner remarked that, as it could not have been a case of life or death, it was a sorry criticism on the author, to go away like that; and he called me 'Fricka.' Agreed: I made no protest against the name." That is one side of the Mariafeld story, but, the recollection being more than a third of a century older than its record, it is allowable to presume that the hostess earned her title 'Fricka' rather in connection with some private comment on *Die Walküre*. Not much sympathy with his "gigantic poem" can have rewarded the guest for his labours of those three evenings (why no *Rheingold?*) in any case, or we should have had at least one word of praise, were it only of that elocution which stamped itself upon the memory of every other audience. At the obverse of the medal we shall arrive in a moment; for the private reading was soon followed by the public one to which Frau Wille has just referred, though her husband and self were absent from the neighbourhood at the time of its occurrence.

Wagner's objection to publicity was not without its mental reservation, as the very day after private issue of his poem's text,

---

* Indeed he had run short much earlier than that, for Bülow writes a Herr H. Gottwald (contributor to the *Neue Zeitschrift*) Jan. 30, '57: "I have not forgotten the Nibelungen poem for you. But Wagner has no more copies on hand, so it seems."

with that prefatory warning to incautious friends, he sent out the following invitation card to all his Zurich acquaintances :—

Zu einer Vorlesung meiner kürzlich vollendeter dramatischen Dichtung : "**Der Ring des Nibelungen,**" deren einzelne Theile ich an vier auf einander folgenden Abenden (nämlich am 16ten, 17ten, 18ten und 19ten dieses Monates) jedesmal um 6 Uhr, *im unteren Saale des Dépendance-Gebäudes des Hôtel de Baur* vorzutragen gedenke, lade ich Sie [blank for name]
hierdurch freundschaftlichst ein.

Sehr gern werde ich auch den Herrn oder die Dame meinen Vorlesungen zugegen wissen, die Sie, in der Voraussetzung näherer Theilnahme für den Gegenstand, auch uneingeladen mir zuführen sollten.

ZURICH, 12. Februar 1853

RICHARD WAGNER.

Strictly speaking, then, the invitation is not confined even to distant acquaintances, for each recipient of the card is begged to bring "a gentleman or lady whom you may consider likely to be interested." Consequently the audience of February 16 to 19 was somewhat mixed, much to the disgust of Herwegh, who pointedly absented himself after the first evening. In a note of Wagner's touching this supercilious abstention we have the aforesaid other side to that story of the worthy hostess of Mariafeld: "Best Friend!—I'm not in the least put out by your staying away from my recitations—at the most by your staying away from my house—as I'm so knocked up that I've hardly been out of doors since; and when I *have* made a little promenade, the confounded $3\frac{1}{2}$ flights of the *Hôtel de Herwegh* were enough to scare me. Then I kept asking myself if it really were not just as far from me to you, as from me to you—or rather, the other way about.—By the bye, the people who had shocked you, were not invited by myself, but brought by others. For that matter, my imaginative faculty had far better scope before this larger audience that I could not see, than before the *unhappily too visible one* of the family Wille: by dint of a little illusion I thoroughly enjoyed myself.—Here also is your copy. Adieu! Your R. Wagner. February 23, 1853." The said copy of the Ring-poem bore the playful dedication, "Seinem Freunde Georg Herwegh zur Fortsetzung, von Richard Wagner, Zürich, Februar 53"—which, being interpreted, means "For his friend G. H. to write a sequel."

From the above an ordinary mind would scarcely deduce that Herwegh was out of sympathy with his friend's creation. Yet the writer of the article in *Die Gegenwart* (its editor, Th. Zolling, Jan. 1897) whence I borrow these two documents, goes on to remark that Herwegh "considered this spoken and printed publication of the singular text unwise. Neither the mystical [misprint for "mythical"?] long-winded subject, nor the uncouth form, was agreeable to the poet; nevertheless he did not doubt that the gifted musician would succeed in making the 'Stabreim-stammer' seem fluent and natural in his symphonic flood of tone. Frau Emma Herwegh, who had then rejoined her husband with their children, derived a like unfavourable impression from the brochure" (most kind of her to mention it); and later, apropos of a private musical recital of some portion of the RING (1856?), "Herwegh was of opinion that the Stabreims had in fact become more palatable through the glorious music veiling them."

How guardedly we must accept Herr Zolling's unsupported statements in this article, may be judged from the gloss with which he prefaces the letter of February '53: "After his 'Siegfried' and 'Walküre' the musician-of-the-future had just completed his Rheingold-poem, and read the whole aloud, first at Mariafeld, and then before an invited public at Zurich. Its success was dubious. Semper found it frightful. Keller remarked 'Sheer Ettmüller!' Herwegh remained away after the first evening, and, taken to task by Wagner, complained of various unsympathetic guests." Really, a raconteur should be a shade more careful with his local colour: neither Semper nor Keller arrived in Zurich till nearly three years later! The attempt to put a hostile construction on Herwegh's abstinence stands therefore self-revealed. Nor is the narrator's position improved by reference to Herwegh's wife, since that lady manifestly did not reach Zurich till *after* the memorable reading; whereas her personal, or racial bias against Wagner weights the whole of this *Gegenwart* article (so obviously inspired by herself), and artlessly betrays its origin in the following bevue: "Among Herwegh's papers [*Nachlass*—he died in 1875] are to be found still further vestiges of Wagner's Zurich exile 1849-1858. Thus a volume, bound in red leather, containing his polemical writings of that time; among them the anonymous first edition of 'Judaism in Music, by Freigedank.' 'Wagner'sche Broschüren' stands written thereon

in the master's small, regular hand, fine as if engraved. Also in the beautiful correspondence of Georg and Emma Herwegh, which unfortunately is still withheld from publicity, the poet-composer often recurs." If a writer can thus go out of his way to drag *Judaism in Music* into a wellnigh impossible collocation,* one may guess how much of credence should be paid to the spiteful adornments of the rest of his tale. At this chapter's end I shall give documentary evidence of Keller's true opinion of the Ring-poem upon making its first acquaintance: it will then be seen whether we ought to follow Herwegh's widow in debiting her husband with her own low estimate of Wagner's poetic gifts.

As for our hero's allusion to the "unfortunately too visible family Wille," that of course refers to the previous private reading at Mariafeld, and its mention proves that Herwegh was present on *that* occasion and sympathised with Wagner's sufferings, however caused; consequently that the reason he advanced for abstention from the three last evenings of the public recital was no mere trumped-up pretext, as suggested by the *Gegenwart*.

---

* The said "first edition" of *Judaism*—the only one signed "Freigedank" ("K. Freigedank," to be precise), and the only one previous to the pamphlet of 1869—was not published as a "brochure" at all; and it is extremely difficult to imagine the large 4° pages of the *Neue Zeitschrift* being "bound" together with the 8° *Theatre at Zurich* etc. But this *Gegenwart* article (in two instalments, Jan. 2 and 9, '97) simply bristles with absurdities: whenever an undated letter of Wagner's is cited therein, it is robbed of historic value by assignment to a demonstrably wrong year; whilst we are regaled with such ineptitudes as the grotesque misstatement, "Liszt came to Zurich in October, with his friend the P^{ss} Carolyne Wittgenstein, to give concerts there."—In a more recent issue of *Die Gegenwart* (Oct. 21, '99) to which I shall have to refer hereafter concerning Minna, poor Glasenapp is rapped on the knuckles for having "passed other unfavourable sources in dead silence" and "diligently used and transcribed the Wagner-articles in the 'Gegenwart' of 1897 without acknowledgment." Herr Glasenapp needs no defender; but it may be as well to add that he has simply made use of the historian's privilege by quoting a few portions of the *documentary* components of the Wagner-Herwegh article. It is customary, no doubt, to make a bow of indebtedness to the first purveyor; yet, would Herr Zolling have thoroughly enjoyed himself, if that bow had been accompanied by a caution? To have mentioned the "unfavourable source" would have necessitated a warning to Herr Glasenapp's readers even more emphatic than that I have now given to mine, that—apart from the actual documents directly reproduced by Herr Zolling, the authenticity whereof we gladly endorse—the "Wagner-articles" in *Die Gegenwart* of Jan. '97 are by no means models of reliability.

Neither can the "success" of that recital in the Dépendance of the Hôtel Baur have been so "dubious"; otherwise Wagner would never have declared that he "thoroughly enjoyed himself." At anyrate the Zurich tradition runs as follows:* "Wagner sat on a raised chair beside the fireplace; in the body of the room were grouped his hearers. With or against their will, they were carried away by the plastic objectivity with which he summoned his heroes to life or conjured up the scenery in full distinctness, and above all by an impassioned declamation that almost rose at times to song."

The mental impressions of a bygone generation are naturally most difficult to recall; but here is what Liszt reports of the effect still vivid in some of those hearers' minds just five months later than the reading: "This evening Wagner is going to begin a [private] reading of his *Nibelungen*, and people tell me that his delivery is fascinating beyond conception. The four-evening recital, which he lately gave to a select and non-paying audience, made a great sensation in the town and environs of Zurich—as also did his concerts at the theatre, which have won him '*tous les suffrages*,' even those of the citizen-Philistines who were most prejudiced against him" (to Carolyne, July 4, 53). And two days later, after listening to the first half of the Ring-poem himself, Liszt lays stress on the reciter's "incredible energy and intelligence of accent."

What was Wagner's object in giving the Zurichers this semi-public recital? Probably there was a touch of the *ballon d'essai*, a feeler toward eventual performance of the tetralogy in years to come; just as his letter of Feb. 11 had expressed the wish that he could read the poem aloud to the Court of Weimar, and as his *Siegfried's Tod* had actually been read aloud at Zurich in March 1851 (vol. iii, 233-4). But the little note to Herwegh shews that this was not the only or even the chief motive: "I thoroughly enjoyed myself." It was the overwhelming "impulse to impart," of which we hear so much in the *Communication;* that most natural longing of the dramatist to make his figures live and move before him, if only in reflection from the white sheet of a mixed audience; the same longing that had bidden

* To quote from Herr Steiner's *Neujahrsblatt* 1902, whence is also borrowed the reproduction of the invitation-card.

him loose his private purse-strings to print the poem for his friends.

There is a wide difference, however, between the author's reading his own work out, especially if he be a born elocutionist, and his allowing it to be nipped in the bud by the frosty breath of others; and we very soon find Wagner protesting against continuance of such a thing. Early in April Liszt announces to him that a reading of the four dramas will shortly be undertaken by Hofrath Schöll for a select assembly at the Altenburg; a month later Liszt writes that the reading has been "excellently" given, but by a Hofrath Sauppe, headmaster of the Weimar Grammar-school: Wagner significantly omits to notice it in his long reply. Mid-July Liszt tells him that Herr Moritz (husband of Roeckel's sister) is about to read the RING at Wiesbaden that month: Wagner again takes no immediate notice. But in a letter of Aug. 16, apropos of nothing that appears in the Correspondence (unless the "B" be a misprint for "M," though the context rather points to Brendel), he suddenly explodes with "B. is not to read out my Nibelungen.—How I regret having ever had the poem printed! It shall not be bandied to and fro and like this: it still is *mine*." The author's vexation seems reasonable: it would have been better to publish the poem outright, than to let it be mumbled at place after place by people necessarily without the remotest idea of its peculiar laws of rhythm. If a halt were not called at once, the work might be done to death or ever its first few scenes were set to music. It still was private property, though printed for the delectation of its author's friends.

Now for those friends' response to this gift that was at once a loan.

The first to answer is Franz Liszt himself (Feb. 20, '53): "You are indeed a man of wonders, and your Nibelungen-poem is certainly the most incredible thing you have created as yet. So soon as the three performances of your *Dutchman*, *Tannhäuser* and *Lohengrin* are over, I shall shut myself in for a couple of days, to read the 4 poems. Just now I cannot get an hour to myself. . . . Forgive me, then, if I say nothing more concerning it to-day, than that I heartily rejoice in the joy the printed copies have given you. . . . The princess [Wittgenstein] read your Nibelungen-Ring from beginning to end the first day, and is enthusiastic

about it." So it really is Carolyne's opinion that reaches Wagner first, and that is largely influenced by the "Nicht Gut, nicht Gold . . . lässt die *Liebe* nur sein," which the composer hereafter abandons, but the princess chooses for a daily greeting to the elect of her heart. Liszt's own opinion of the poem is nowhere formulated in other than general terms; no thought, no character, no situation, does he ever select for specific mention (until the music brings it on the tapis); but in the same letter of April 8 in which he refers to that daily greeting, he tells the author, "Don't take it ill of me, that I have not yet written you more exhaustively about the Nibelungen-Ring. It is not for me to analyse and judge so extraordinary a work, but I am resolved to gain it later its befitting place. I have all along begged you not to desist from the work, and am highly delighted at its poetic completion."

It would be unfair to expect of Liszt an "exhaustive" literary criticism; yet some more definite appreciation, some sign that he had been particularly impressed by this or that, would have come as balm to the heart of an author who already had waited weeks for a word of intelligent comprehension of the ripest fruit of his creative genius. For Liszt's wellnigh perfunctory praise is an answer to these thirsty words of Wagner's: "Toward 11 o'clock each morning I look out for the postman with uncontrollable impatience; if he brings me nothing—or nothing comforting—my whole day is a desert of resignation. That is my daily life!—Why do I still live?—Oft do I make unheard-of efforts to draw in something from outside: thus did I lately get my new poem printed—as a forcible reminder that I am alive, I send it to every friend whom I might at all suppose it would interest. In that way I hoped to *compel* people to send me a sign of their existence in return:—Franz Müller of Weimar and Karl Ritter have written me in reply—not another soul has even thought it worth while to acknowledge receipt" (March 30).

A terrible disheartenment, after so immense an effort; yet silence were better than the reply which Liszt wisely intercepted, from the only man of literary note who had received the new work. With his gospel of the "free *man*," one would have thought there had been much in the RING DES NIBELUNGEN to appeal to Adolf Stahr in particular, quite apart from the grandeur of the drama as a whole. But no: root and branch he condemns it!

The case is worth investigation.—To this friend and former sympathiser Liszt had apparently despatched a copy at Wagner's request within a fortnight of receiving his parcel; for Stahr writes him on the 6th of March, "I had already heard of Wagner's colossal poem through the newspapers (Kühne's *Europa*, if I mistake not). I am rejoiced that he has carried out the great idea set forth some eight or nine years ago by the Tübingen æsthete Vischer in his *Kritische Gänge* (part 2), and has ventured the attempt to make the mighty German epos accessible to our contemporaries in a new form." Here it should be observed that Stahr is about to approach Wagner's poem with a whole sheaf of preconceived ideas. He is already possessed with F. T. Vischer's prior suggestion, which Mr Chamberlain characterises in his *Richard Wagner* as a plan for turning the *Nibelungenlied* itself into a spectacular five-act opera, rejecting all the Northern mythic elements, depriving Brynhild of her Valkyrieship ab initio, killing off Siegfried in the second act, and making Chriemhild the central figure of the grand climax. Moreover, Stahr has either not received his copy of the poem yet, or not yet cut its pages, though the date of his critical tirade to Liszt is merely nine days later, namely "Berlin, 15/3, 1853": a week was far too short a time to devote to study of a work which necessarily upset so many preconceptions. — Of that astounding criticism I reproduce a fragment here,* to illustrate the density of the rarest Literary atmosphere in the Germany of half a century back:—

Either *I* am incapable of understanding or feeling what is possible, presentable and dramatically effective, what is tragic and humanly touching—or, *from beginning to end this poem is one huge failure, as colossal and gigantic as the monstrous sagas whence it sprang* [the italics everywhere are Stahr's]. . . . Just because I have advocated his earlier works with enthusiasm and love, because I have extolled the *poet* as well as the musician in Lohengrin and Tannhäuser—just for that reason I have a right, nay, the duty to send him through you a word of warning entreaty to quit a path whereon, I fear, not *one* of his true friends will follow him. This poem is in *every respect* a falling-off from his whole previous manner. . . . Heaven only knows how Wagner, instead of taking the grandly simple, humanly seizable, profoundly stirring *motives of the Nibelungenlied*, which offered him the most splendid matter for a pair of tragic music-dramas [*sic*],

* A translation of the full text will be found in the Appendix.

"Siegfried's Death" and "Chriemhild's Vengeance," could have brewed this preposterous hotch-potch of four dramas out of the old Norse saga! . . .

I will not descend to details. Indeed it is not the detail, I attack; 'tis the work in its entirety, on *every* side. . . .

To Wagner himself I cannot write, at least not under the burden of the first impression. That I reserve for later. But should my opinion be more or less your own—as I venture to hope—nothing could do the poet so great a service as unsparing declaration of the plain unvarnished truth; and if he is still to be saved, it can only be by leaving him *not one foot of the field* on which he here has trenched.

The above proves Wagner's wisdom in refusing to make his poem public property just yet. If a man of Stahr's brilliant culture and general well-disposedness could thus sweepingly condemn the most original, if not the grandest drama of the past three centuries, what might not be expected of the lesser journalistic tribe? A thousand wasp-tails might have stung the work to death.

Liszt prudently refrains from conveying to Wagner more than a line of this intemperate harangue, but couples it with an observation which leads us to infer that the majority of his associates had formed an equally adverse estimate: "Stahr has written me a long letter in which he absolutely declares your poem a total blunder etc. I have not sent this letter on to you, as I hold it needless, and can in no way share his opinion. By word of mouth I will tell you of various others that I meantime let pass without dispute or comment" (Apr. 8). Wagner's reply is of great interest, shewing him so confident in the future of his work that he can afford to smile at its disparagement, for once in a way at least: "Stahr's verdict on my poem is a sop to my vanity, i.e. with regard to *my* judgment of him. In spite of all, I have always held Stahr for a confirmed littérateur, whom *you* once snatched out of himself for an instant, but only for an instant. A littérateur, however, *cannot* comprehend me: it needs a whole *man* or true *artist*. No matter! Once I have thrown everything else on one side, to plunge head and ears in the fountain of music again, the thing shall *sound* in such a fashion that these people shall hear what they never can see." That is the last we hear of Stahr in connection with Wagner.

Besides Liszt's colourless own, the only laudation preserved

to us from these first few months of the Ring-poem's existence is that of Louis Köhler,* contained in a letter to Liszt: "Wagner has provided me with an immensely high delight by sending me his Nibelungen—for which I have to thank your intercession. I am still busy reading the book. At first it struck me as queer, yet attracted me in the way a queer thing does. Gradually, however, I found my depth, and now feel at home in it with a veritable joy of Walhall. The work takes me with a *power* quite unique, and I've no fancy to vex my spirit with reflections. 'Tis fine indeed, when they do not force themselves upon one; the book's after-effect will bring them soon enough. I don't believe so truly *splendid* a piece of poetry has been written for centuries, so forcible and yet so easy—simple in its speech; there is pith in every word. Everything in it seems *big* to me, even optically considered: the figures of the gods loom large before me, yet of a strength ideally beautiful; their voices I hear sounding afar, and when they move, the sky is set in motion. The diction *is* already music, and therefore impossible to 'set to music.' I have a clear presentiment of the [mode of] completion and actual performance of this work, and from the swing and animated grouping of Wagner's verses I feel out a kind of speech-melody, such as hovered before me as the last ideal of tone-discourse when working at my book. . . . Wodan stands out sublime as if cast in bronze, yet so humanly seizable withal. The close of the first act of 'Walküre' is overwhelming. God, how I felt myself Siegmund! While reading, my soul seems to expand as if peering from some mountain-top into a vast new world."

Rambling though it is, this constitutes one of the most striking impressionist records of the poem's magical effect on an artistic temperament, and would have been of infinite encouragement to the dramatist, had he really received it. But there we meet one of the many puzzles in the Wagner-Liszt Correspondence. Köhler's letter is dated "Königsberg, July 3, 1853," and therefore reached Weimar while Liszt was away at Zurich (vid. cap. IV); Liszt writes Wagner "17 July—Weymar," with a postscript "I am enclosing you a letter of Köhler's, which you will kindly return

* Born 1820, died 1886; chiefly, and widely, known for his educational pianoforte works. At this period he advocated Liszt and Wagner in the press.

me. Have you read his brochure 'Melody of Speech'? Perhaps you will send him a couple of lines"; yet on the 24th Wagner writes Köhler a long appreciation of that same "Melody of Speech" (see 153*n* & App.), and encloses it in a letter of the 26th to Liszt, for the latter to forward, but without a syllable of allusion in either to the young man's panegyric. Perhaps Liszt had forgotten to slip it into his envelope, after all; if so, more's the pity.

After the littérateur we have had the musician; chronology would take us to the politician next, to Roeckel; but we will jump some eighteen months ahead, and call on the philosopher.

When describing the outward physiognomy of the first edition of the RING, I based my report on the copy presented by Wagner to Schopenhauer (p. 70 *ant.*). It was not until about September or October 1854 that the dramatist made acquaintance with any of the Frankfort sage's works: in a couple of months he despatched at a venture the copy aforesaid, as we learn from Schopenhauer's letter to Frauenstädt already-quoted, dated December 30, '54. After referring to an invitation from Zurich, with which we will deal hereafter, the philosopher proceeds: "Then comes a book by Richard Wagner, not to be procured through the book-trade, but printed privately for friends, on superb thick paper and neatly got up. It is called 'Der Ring des Nibelungen,' and is a series of 4 operas, which he means to compose some day—presumably the authentic Artwork of the Future: seems to be very fantastic: have only read the prologue as yet: shall see how it goes on. No letter with it, but simply inscribed 'Aus Verehrung und Dankbarkeit.'" There is no further mention of the poem in any of Schopenhauer's published letters, though we shortly shall find that he studied it pretty closely. On the other hand, we have two personal recollections by third parties, which I will first present for whatever they may be worth :—

In her reminiscences, originally published in the *Deutsche Rundschau* of 1887, Frau Wille tells us that Wagner remarked to her one day, nearly ten years after dedication of this unique copy, "Do you remember the greeting Wille once brought me from Schopenhauer? 'Give your friend Wagner my thanks for sending me his Nibelungen; but tell him he should put music on the shelf, as he has more genius for poetry. I, Schopenhauer, remain faithful to Rossini and Mozart.' Do you imagine I owe the

philosopher a grudge for *that?*" It is not improbable that some such conversation took place; yet its wording bears a suspicious resemblance to part of the other story, which had preceded it by four years, namely that of a certain R. von Hornstein in the *Neue freie Presse* of 1883. In September 1855, so Hornstein tells us, he paid his first visit to Schopenhauer, bearing him greetings from Wagner, whereupon the philosopher remarked; "Dr Wille has already brought me greetings from him. He sent me his trilogy. The fellow is a poet, no musician. To be sure, there are some wild goings-on in it. In one place 'the curtain falls quickly'; if it didn't fall quickly, we should get some pretty things to see." A slight refreshment of memory may be inferred from the latter half of Hornstein's story also; refreshment, in this case by an article that had appeared in the *Berliner Tageblatt* a year before (July 24, 1882), containing the chief of Schopenhauer's own glosses on his private copy of the RING.

Before taking those glosses, we must go back to the reference to *The Artwork of the Future* in the letter to Frauenstädt, as it proves that Schopenhauer already had some vague idea of the poet-musician's artistic aims. He had derived it from Wagner's detractors, however, since he writes May 20, '54, to J. A. Becker, "Dr Lindner sends me a Berlin musical weekly, the *Echo* of May 7 and 14, where passages on music in my writings are made use of for a polemic against the operas of Richard Wagner"; and two days later, to Frauenstädt, "Dr Lindner has sent me two most interesting numbers of the musical *Echo*, which will be already known to you. In them the æsthete Kossak belabours Richard Wagner with sayings of mine, very aptly and with good reason. Bravo!" Whether Schopenhauer had himself heard the *Dutchman*, *Tannhäuser* or *Lohengrin*—all three having been recently performed at Frankfort—it is impossible to say; but the last two quotations plainly prove that his mind had been biased against the author of the RING by hostile criticism of a nature peculiarly flattering to his own vanity, and that would go toward counterbalancing the still more recent flattery of the invitation to Zurich and the dedication "in reverence and gratitude." Whichever prepossession gained the mastery—for sages themselves have human weaknesses—a personal curiosity had been aroused. Nevertheless, had he not found something very different in the Ring-poem from what A. Stahr had found, I cannot imagine that

Schopenhauer would have taken the trouble to read his presentation copy carefully from end to end, still less to furnish it with so many private annotations and cross-references. Obviously he regarded it as a work worth attentive perusal, though it stirred his gall from time to time.

So numerous are Schopenhauer's mute underlinings of single words or verses in the RING, that I must reserve them for a schedule in the Appendix, here taking only the more energetic features of his criticism. Evidently he has a strong dislike of neologisms, for he continually trips Wagner up on account of some elided prefix or new compound, though he never descends to the puerility of objecting to such nature-sounds as the Rhine-daughters' "Wagalaweia" or the Valkyries' "Hojotoho." For all his dubbing *Das Rheingold* "fantastic," he marks with a manifest sign of approval Loge's "alt und grau, gries und grämlich, welkend zum Spott aller Welt, erstirbt der Götter Stamm" (p. 38); whilst his own theory of nocturnal communion with the soul of the world finds an echo in his double scoring of Erda's lines, "was ich sehe, sagen dir nächtlich die Nornen." Unfortunately for our inquiry, admiration is mostly passive, with an educated reader, but irritation rushes to the hasty pencil. Consequently Schopenhauer's articulate notes, all of them more or less impulsively objurgatory, afford no positive index to his general estimate. Such as they are, however, it is the historian's duty to register them, were it only in illustration of the old saying that even Homer nods at times.

On the second half of act i of *Die Walküre* falls the brunt of the sage's onslaught. "Morals one may forget for once in a way; but one must not slap them in the face," is pencilled atop the two pages that correspond to the present 18-22; "Go and murder my husband" (this time in English) at the end of Sieglinde's long recital; and in still larger characters at the bottom of those pages, "It is infamous!" From a man of Schopenhauer's intellectual grasp, and wide experience of the classics, this ebullition is astonishing; but—he reads on, and by the time he arrives at the curtain's fall he has cooled down to the aforesaid "And high time too!" The fact of his reading on is of much importance, though it has of course been neglected by those who hitherto have cited him in support of their own objections to this scene. At the very least, he must have been struck by the poet's

power, or he would have flung the book aside, perhaps destroyed it. Quite the contrary: he studiously proceeds, though it is with a somewhat ruffled temper that he approaches act ii; to which we may attribute his comments on the scene with Fricka, "Wodan under the slipper," and "Wodan cowers and obeys." No other articulate note, merely a few ambiguous marks do we find, until the close of this act, when he adorns Brünnhilde's "Treff' ihn, Siegmund" with a quotation from Goethe's Mephistopheles, "Stosst Ihr nur immer, ich parire!" ("You've but to thrust, I'll do the parrying").—The opening of act iii calls forth a whole coruscation of glosses, directed, if you please, against the wording of mere stage-directions. Half a dozen compounds, chiefly of "Fels," are here underlined, and annotated with "So!" "Ohren! Ohren" ("Ears"), "So," "Ohren," culminating in "He has no ears, the deaf musicianer!" A page or so later, in the Valkyries' scene, we have a feeble sarcasm, "The clouds play the principal rôle," and again "So!" and "Ohren," to mark the purist's resentment at unorthodox (?) compounds in the simple stage-directions. Finally, in the last scene of act iii, Brynhild's "schweige den Zorn" (p. 75) is underlined, and across the top of the page is written "Die Sprache muss das *Leibeigen* des Herrn seyn"; which may be paraphrased as "The gentleman seems to think he may take what liberties he likes with language"—a back-handed tribute to the novelty of Wagner's mode of condensation.

To Schopenhauer the "Fels" compounds are as a red rag to a bull, for he rushes at *Der junge Siegfried* with an "Ohr!" against a harmless, inoffensive "Felsstücken" in its opening stage-directions; nor can he resist the temptation to write "So!?" against a "Felsenwand" in those that usher in act ii, and "al solito" against the "Felsenberges" in those for the first scene of act iii. Apart from these, his only other verbal comments on this drama consist in "The Welps," misspelt in English, against "die Welpen" (p. 13); a "doch!" against Siegfried's "doch kroch nie ein Fisch aus der Kröte" (p. 14); "Empörender Undank. Maulschellirter Moral," i.e. "Revolting ingratitude. Morals boxed on the ears," at the top of page 81 of his copy, corresponding to pages 17-19 of the *Siegfried* textbook; and "1848" against Fafner's "Ich lieg' und besitze" (p. 48). The last comment shews that the old Conservative was not unaware that Wagner had been mixed up in the recent revolutionary movement; but

the "revolting ingratitude" is distinctly out of place, at any-rate a gross exaggeration, seeing that Siegfried's "dir Feigen fahr' ich zu Leib, etc." had not come into existence as yet in this first edition. "Morals" have evidently been put a little too sternly on their guard by that scene in the preceding drama.

Siegfried's Tod is far less lavishly adorned with comments than either of its two predecessors, albeit an occasional pencil-mark shews that it likewise was perused by the philosopher. Here we have only three annotations to call for mention. Against Siegfried's "nun ficht mit mir, oder sei mein Freund" (*Gtdg* p. 20) three notes of exclamation are pencilled—as if the critic quite failed to see its lifelike truth to the hero's character. Against Brynhild's "Sein Ross führet daher, etc." (p. 82) stands "Suttee" —in condemnation or otherwise? Against her "dass wissend würde ein Weib" (p. 83) a query is set—almost the only objection with which we can sympathise (p. 63*n ant.*).

On the great question whether Schopenhauer detected in the RING any harmony with his philosophic system, his copy of the poem is practically dumb. In *Rheingold* we found two slight indications pointing that way, and in *D. j. Siegfried* we find a double vertical line on the margin of "Alles ist nach seiner Art: an ihr wirst du nichts wandeln" (p. 49), which certainly suggests that the commentator tracked an agreement with his own views upon the immutability of character. But Wotan's all-important monologue in the *Walküre* and scene with Erda in *Siegfried* are passed in silence. How shall we interpret that silence? As approval, I make bold to think; for it must be remembered that the brief dedication, accompanied by no explanatory letter, would naturally lead the philosopher to conclude that the poem had not only been inscribed, but also *written* by a confirmed disciple. Beyond negative evidence we have nothing to go upon, however, and therefore take an unsatisfied leave of the only encounter between the two contemporary exponents of Abnegation of the Will-to-live.

To sum up: on their face the comments reproduced above do not quite tally with the two little anecdotes of Frau Wille and von Hornstein; but the fact remains, that Schopenhauer was impressed enough to pursue his study to the end, and to pursue it very closely. On the penultimate page of the work we find a

cross-reference to a similar verbal expression in act ii of *Die Walküre* ("trüber Verträge" etc.), and such minute attention goes far to redeem all the vehement explosions. Moreover, the latter were undoubtedly intended for none but the commentator's private eye, and went no farther than his library till death dispersed it. Wagner himself was spared all knowledge of them, and therefore might honestly take in good part whatever message it really was that Dr Wille brought him back from Frankfort.

Pleasanter is it to turn to the opinion of the poet Gottfried Keller. After an absence of several years, spent at Heidelberg and Berlin, Keller returned to his native Zurich in December 1855. Within two months, namely Feb. 21, '56, he writes his friend Hermann Hettner (well known as literary-historian): "I often meet Richard Wagner now, who is decidedly a highly-gifted man and very amiable. Moreover he certainly is a poet, for his Nibelungen-trilogy contains a mine (*Schatz*) of original national poesy in its text. If you have an opportunity, you ought to read it; I am sure you will think so too." On the 16th April of the same year Keller writes Hettner again, thereby shewing that the impression is not only keen but lasting: "I see a good deal of Richard Wagner, who is a gifted and also a good man. If you have the opportunity to read his Nibelungen-trilogy, which he has had printed for friends, please do so. You will find in it a power of poetry, stock-German, but fined by the spirit of antique tragedy. On myself at least it has made that effect." And five days later, to the authoress Ludmilla Assing, niece of Varnhagen von Ense: "Richard Wagner is a highly gifted and entertaining man, of the best culture and true profundity of thought. His new opera-book, the Nibelungen-trilogy, is a full-blown glowing poem in itself, and has made a much deeper impression on me than any other book of poetry I have read for a long time. If you have not read it yet, you must get someone who has it to lend it you." Written three years after Wagner's remark that the "whole man or true artist" alone could truly understand him, those words of Keller's fully confirm it, however he may have drawn back from his enthusiasm in later years: to the musician Köhler and the poet Keller we owe the two most eloquent appreciations in the early years of the poem's printed life; just as to

the mere man of letters, Stahr, is to be debited the only flat denial.*

The turn of the politician has come—for I can scarcely believe that art was the predestined vocation of the sometime sub-conductor August Roeckel. In itself his opinion of the Ring-poem could hardly be of interest to us; yet it is of historic moment, as it dragged Wagner himself into the most singular impasse, in his patient attempt to reply to it.

Of what an opportunity has Roeckel robbed us, by advancing the most exasperatingly wrong objections! True, the poor man was a prisoner; but, had he entertained any real sympathy for the work of his old comrade, his solitary meditations might have led him to find out, and point out, the actual dilemmas in this mighty poem, instead of first harping on the doctrinaire string, and then drawing up a schoolboy's list of queries that any intelligent reader could have answered for himself. His letter of twenty pages long has not come down to us, but the gist of the greater part of it we can deduce for ourselves from that answer which Wagner had shirked for four months, and finally plunged into with desperation in January 1854. Struggling to reply in terms of a correspondent who bids him give up "reveries and egoistic Schwärmerei, and turn to the only real thing, to life and its practical endeavours"—a fine douche of cold water for an artist in the full glow of musical inspiration—Wagner loses his way in his own poem. Here and there we have a flash of light, amid the maze of Feuerbachisms, but on the whole we feel inclined to wonder if it really *is* the RING DES NIBELUNGEN that its author is expounding. One example shall serve for many, though for that purpose I choose an extreme one. Speaking of Siegfried's scene with the Rhinedaughters, Wagner observes that the hero really knows, but sets no store upon the power of the ring, "as he has something better to do." One can only ask *what* that "something better" may be, since the poem shews him simply bent on sport.—Had Roeckel approached his criticism in a different spirit, we might have had a much more fruitful reply

* For a few enigmatic utterances of that literary dabbler, Bettina von Arnim, see Appendix. They are of some adventitious moment, owing to their reference to the brothers Grimm.

from Wagner, illuminating real obscurities, not adding to their number.

Should the reader think it presumptuous to decline to accept this famous letter as a wholly trustworthy guide to the 'meaning' of the RING, I need but refer him to a later one addressed by Wagner to the selfsame correspondent. "How little can the artist expect to see his own conception entirely reproduced in the brain of another," says the poet in August 1856, "seeing that his artwork, if it really be such, remains to himself a riddle in regard whereof he may fall into the same delusions as any other man." And he proceeds to shew how the deliberate aim of the reasoning part of him, to present an "optimistic" picture of the world with a "griefless" Siegfried as the ideal hero, had been unconsciously crossed from the first by that deeper instinct of "renunciation" which had governed his dramatic works from the days of the *Holländer* onward. In that crossing of the two tendencies, the conscious and the unconscious, we have the master-key to all the paradoxes in the Ring-poem, the drama within the drama, as each revision touched a portion of it from a varying standpoint.

Finality? How could there be finality in any human solution of the inscrutable problem of world-existence? In the mind of the philosopher, perhaps, or rather, in his writings; not in the mind of the artist, who cannot but look at all things through the medium of a 'temperament,' and a temperament on which the coming or going of a cloud will leave its impress. Some half-a-dozen times before had Wagner sought to give the answer to that riddle, in Brynhild's farewell words. The form he had adopted for the 1853 edition, "nicht Gut, nicht Gold . . . lässt die *Liebe* nur sein!" he now dismisses as "sententious" (1856), telling Roeckel, "It had been a perpetual torment to me; but it needed the great revolution which Schopenhauer finally effected in my rational apprehension (*Vernunftvorstellung*) to reveal to me the reason of that torment, and supply me with the really fitting key-stone to my poem; which consists in a candid recognition of the true deep state of things, without the least attempt at preaching."

Another revision, then? Undoubtedly we possess one that exactly tallies with the above description, though it bears no date.*

* In the absence of external evidence, I should assign it to the spring or summer of 1856, just before the time which I have surmised for the recasting of the "fear-episode" in *Siegfried* (p. 32 *ant.*).

Posthumously published in the *Bayreuther Blätter* of 1893, it runs as follows:—

BRÜNNHILDE.

Trauernder Minne
tiefstes Mitleid
schloss die Thore mir auf:
Wer über Alles
achtet das *Leben*,
wende sein Auge von mir!
Wer aus *Mitleid*
der Scheidenden nachblickt,
dem dämmert von fern
die *Erlösung*, die ich erlangt.
So scheid' ich,
grüssend, Welt, von dir!

BRÜNNHILDE.

Sorrowing love's
most deep compassion
has opened me the gates:
Who values *life*
above all else,
from me let him turn his eye!
Whom *pity* bids gaze
after her who departs,
on him dawns from afar
the *redemption* I have reached.
So part I, greeting,
World, from thee!

Save for the "Mitleid," this thought had really been contained in the very letter that accompanied the despatch of the first copies of the Ring-poem to Liszt (Feb. 53): "For me there's no redemption more, save—*death!* . . . Pay good heed to my new poem—it comprises the world's beginning and end." But the actual poem of '52-3, equally with the marginal gloss of '49, had confined that "redemption by death" to the gods, and preached an "optimistic" future for the human race. Here, in this sketch from the Schopenhauer period, we have a far broader application of the "Ruhe! Ruhe, du Gott!" yet the door is left open to those who still "value life," quite in keeping with the intention expressed to Roeckel, to avoid all preaching.

That again did not content the author; for he left the sketch of 1856 (?) unpublished. In place thereof, he wrote—we know not when—those beautiful verses "Führ' ich nun nicht mehr nach Walhall's Feste . . . enden sah ich die Welt," which are printed beneath the body of the text in the classical edition of 1872 (*Ges. Schr.* vi), and Mr Forman has so finely rendered in his translation of the poem. Here the "end of the *world*" is still more plainly made the drama's outcome; but it is coupled with the Eastern doctrine of final victory over the law of "rebirth," *

* This may connect the verses with the sketch for *Die Sieger*, May 1856; so that it is just possible that they were *conceived* and rough-drafted before those I have quoted in full, though their ultimate poetic form is certainly more finished. The question of priority is not a point of great importance here, since both are Schopenhauerian in their trend, and both were discarded.

and consequently does not harmonise with the Northern environment. Moreover the "I" and "me" in either of these groups of verses would have detached Siegfried as completely from Brynhild as he already had dropped from Wotan's purview (Waltraute scene). To the reader this implicit displacement of the original hero is highly suggestive; but the dramatist could never let his heroine thus stultify the whole proceedings on the stage at bidding of the reflective poet. For dramatic purposes Brynhild and Siegfried *must* be united in death. "The rest is silence," says dying Hamlet; and where the Ring-poet found no words suffice to breathe the final secret, he turned at last to the musician: "Say you what I keep silent, since you alone can say it; and silent shall I utter all, since my hand it is that guides you" (*P.* III. 337).

III.

FIRST WAGNER-FESTIVAL.

Wagner's portrait published.—Another change of abode; the "imp of luxury."—Second act of Berlin comedy.—Preliminaries of the three-day festival; financial guarantee; bandsmen and choir.—Poems of the three operas read aloud.—The concert-programme.—Festival and complimentary banquet.—Two epilogues: renewed warrant of arrest; torchlight serenade.

> *My chief object was to hear something from*
> *Lohengrin, and in particular the orchestral prelude.*
> R. WAGNER.

THE four-night reading of the RING at the Hôtel Baur, Feb. 16-19, 1853, had been directly preceded by a concert of the Zurich 'Panharmonic' (Allg. Mus. Gesellschaft) on the 15th, Wagner's first public appearance since the *Holländer* week last Spring. It was followed by another Panharmonic on the 8th of March. Of these two concerts there is nothing more to say, than that Wagner conducted Beethoven's Seventh symphony at the first of them, the Eroica at the second; "I'm somewhat more than usually knocked up to-day," he tells F. Heine, "for I screwed out of the bandsmen here a quite magnificent rendering of the Eroica yesterday." In the interval—and a letter of Feb. 22, to be precise—he had expressed to the committee his wish to get up a special concert, consisting of extracts from his operas, if the said society would make the business arrangements an affair of its own. To the various negotiations etc. for this historic Wagner-festival I shall return. As it did not take place till May, we will occupy ourselves with other facts meanwhile.

First, then, for a portrait taken this Spring, to replace the old dressing-gown effigy drawn by E. Kietz in the early forties,* which

* Together with Wagner's *Autobiographic Sketch*, it had been published in Laube's *Elegante* Feb. 1843 (see vol. i, 351). A facsimile from the original draw-

had done duty far too long. We shall have to glance back to 1851, however, to obtain a connected idea of this affair, which virtually dates from the time of the *Communication to my Friends*:—

Soon after Uhlig's return to Dresden from his Zurich visit, Wagner sent him a postscript reply to a letter just received (Sept. 15, '51): "The portraits are already on the road." What those "portraits" were, we are left to gather from two letters of a few weeks later, in the first whereof, dated Dec. 3, Wagner writes: "My Zurich art-purveyor seems to have made a mess of things, as you people have received no portraits yet. I'll inquire again to-day. Meanwhile please tell me whether you perhaps want me to send you a number of copies direct, for you or someone else to sell; in that case, how many you need, and so on;" in the second, dated Dec. 13: "With regard to the portraits, inquiry should be made of Heinrich Kirchner, bookseller in Leipzig. Some time ago he received from Fuessli of Zurich a consignment of 100 copies —certainly more than will ever be bought, however renowned you mean to make me." The name of Fuessli supplies a clue, for Adolphe Jullien's *R. Wagner, sa vie et ses œuvres* contains (p. 45) a reproduction of that likeness from the early forties, signed to the left "Auf Stein gez. v. C. Schleuchzer," to the right "Lith. v. Orell, Füssli & Cie, in Zurich."*

Uhlig, therefore, was anxious for circulation of what Wagner soon thereafter stigmatises as the "silly old dressing-gown likeness." Why it was ever revived, heaven only knows; nor is the date of its revival much more manifest, save that it necessarily fell

---

ing faces page 42 of Mr Chamberlain's *Richard Wagner*. Here the artist's signature is followed by *two* dates, the fainter one appearing to be "Jan. 40," whereas the final and distincter one is "Paris. Janv. 1842." Whichever date we accept, the sitter is given much too juvenile and simpering an air, quite out of harmony with those days of Parisian hardships, and utterly unsuitable for reproduction in the fifties.

* In Jullien's book the picture further bears a motto in Wagner's hand, "Der Erzeuger des Kunstwerkes der Zukunft" etc., which the student will recognise as the closing paragraph of *Opera and Drama*. It is some comfort to know that this motto did not form part of the original lithograph; evidently it was hand-written for a special private presentation, as it does not appear on other existing copies.—Franz Müller's brochure on *Tannhäuser*, published 1853, has a frontispiece engraved after the same dressing-gown portrait, or rather, after the lithograph therefrom; it is an improvement on the original, but we cannot be surprised at Wagner's growing pretty sick of it.

within the first two years of Wagner's Zurich period. Seeing that we hear nothing of this business prior to Uhlig's visit, we might be tempted to attribute the reproduction to an ill-judged entreaty of his (cf. vol. iii, 479), were it not difficult to imagine Wagner not rather selecting in 1851 the *second* portrait drawn by Kietz (in 1850). Perhaps, then, the offending lithograph had its origin in the very earliest months of Wagner's Zurich sojourn (1849), before Kietz' second portrait, when other friends were urging him to make a little stir; so that Uhlig would merely have given fresh impetus to a neglected means of notoriety.

Whichever way, we may absolve Wagner himself from any more than a passive responsibility for the anachronism, as his letter of Dec. 3, '51, proceeds: "As I am out of Germany now, and shall probably remain away a goodish time; therefore, as it is conceivable that my friends might be glad to have a good likeness of me in front of them (in default of my bodily self)—and as it annoys me not to step before them as I am to-day, but forever in my look of so much earlier—distorted, to boot, by the violent pains of lithography; in view of all this, I am almost taken with the very vain notion that it might not be amiss if a German music-publisher or print-seller were to decide to bring out a new portrait of me. He would only need to give the order to a portrait-painter here to draw me and send him the drawing—*voilà tout!* —Perhaps the likeness taken by Kietz in March last year—a capital one, in my opinion—might be used for the purpose. All that is needed, is somebody to take it up: naturally *I* cannot offer the suggestion, but perhaps you or someone else could." Kietz's second portrait was not made use of, nevertheless; nor need we much regret it. I have already discussed this picture in volume iii (p. 35), but here may add a detail: namely, the artist's subsequent admission that he was haunted, while sketching it, by a fancied resemblance between his sitter's full-face and that of Bonaparte. This straining beyond a faithful presentment will largely explain the lack of individuality in both the portraits drawn by Kietz.

In the Spring of 1852 we have the portrait question cropping up in yet another form: "If Brendel wants to have a joke with a picture of me [for the *Neue Zeitschrift*] pray don't let him take the old drawing, which isn't a bit like me now: better from a new daguerreotype" (to U., March 20). Five days later: "Yesterday

a portrait-painter and lithographer waylaid me. He's determined to draw me on his own account; his trials pleased me much, and probably he'll hook me. So Brendel comes back to my mind. If he means to give me, he really mustn't take the old smudge. As it is *my* phiz, I have some personal interest in it; and I've lost all patience with that silly old dressing-gown likeness. Beg him, therefore, rather not to give my portrait at all. If the painter here makes a good job of me, the size will naturally be large, and probably won't do for the journal. So let it drop." Apr. 9: "I wrote you lately about a painting animal who wanted to take me: it's done. The first attempt was bad, as the ass didn't know me at all; so Herwegh came to the sittings, and under his minute directions—with his practised eye—a really good likeness has resulted. It will appear here soon, and I offered it yesterday to Breitkopf and Härtel for publication in Germany. It won't be of use to Brendel, though. Moreover, what could he want me for? So arrange your present portrait-dealings accordingly." The references to the "painting animal" are diverting, but nobody seems to know what became of his handiwork; on the other hand, that is the last we hear of Uhlig's "portrait-dealings." Certainly Breitkopf and Härtel did *not* take up the mysterious portrait of 1852, for they are approached again in the Spring of 1853 with regard to another, of much more satisfactory origin and history.

Once more the instigation comes from without. March 9, 1853, Wagner writes his old Dresden friend F. Heine: "The Leipzig *Illustrirte* wants to make a fuss of me again, in connection with Tannhäuser: they would also like to add a portrait of me, from a new photograph. I tried it; but with no decent result, owing to unpropitious weather. So at last—in spite of my dislike to sitting—I have yielded to the solicitations of a lady portrait-painter here, who is really a very clever water-colourist, and am having myself sketched: the *Illustrirte* is to receive a photographic copy. The picture is turning out so remarkably good, in the opinion of all who are watching its growth, that we have conceived the idea of having a lithograph made at last for my friends in Germany from a portrait that really does resemble my present self."

The subject is pursued at some length in this and three subsequent letters to Heine: from which we learn that the name of the artist is Frau Clementine Stockar-Escher; that Wagner is annoyed with "the caricatures now being sold of him"; that the

lithographer he selected was Hanfstängl, then of Dresden, while Heine was to keep an eye on the fidelity of the reproduction; and finally that Breitkopf and Härtel undertook the publication, after the usual beating about the bush. Liszt writes June 23, "I have just received your portrait from Härtel, and it looks far more like you than the earlier one . . . but I cannot bear lithographed portraits, as they always have rather a bourgeois appearance;"* whilst Wagner writes Fischer, July 1, that the lithograph "has turned out capitally, and the lady painter in particular is very pleased with it. I find the eyebrows and the mouth too full—had I brows like that, I should be a different chap, a second Lüttichau."

This Stockar-Escher portrait, the only standard one of Wagner for many years to come, the reader will find as frontispiece to the present volume, in the shape of a photogravure expressly taken from the fine engraving recently executed by Herr Robert Leemann after the original painting and published in Herr Steiner's *Neujahrsblatt* of 1901. Though the composition is a trifle Byronic, and the eyes themselves (besides the eyebrows) are given a preternatural largeness, the likeness seems to be distinctly good, and the lady has caught the characteristic breadth of forehead and square protuberance of chin immeasurably better than the male artist in Paris had done.

Was *this* the likeness attached by the Saxon police to their renewed warrant of arrest next June (p. 115 *inf.*)? There can scarcely be a doubt of it, since the proposed article on *Tannhäuser* had appeared in the Leipzig *Illustrirte* of April 9,† accompanied by an engraved head of the composer, manifestly taken from a photograph of Frau Escher's painting such as is mentioned in the following note: "The phototypist who made the copies had the idiocy to leave the aquarelle in the sun, which has turned it so pale etc." (to F. Heine, Apr. 30, '53).

---

* Liszt suggests a medallion in relief, and such a cast is executed by Eugene Sayn-Wittgenstein before the year is out: a work of no importance. Wagner remarks on it to Liszt (Apr. '54), "It isn't bad—though somewhat infirm"; a criticism fully borne out by the photogravure to be found in Herr Steiner's brochure of 1902.

† The article is signed "A. S.," which may possibly stand for Adolf Stahr. It occupies three folio pages, including the illustrations, and is intelligently and sympathetically written.

On the lady artist's part, the portrait-painting had been a gratuitous tribute to genius; for she owned the large block of buildings in which the Wagners resided, among others, and therefore was of by no means slender means. During the sittings a change of abode was presumably discussed, since the tenant removed within two or three weeks to a larger and more convenient flat on the second floor of the Escherhäuser (to the right of the main entrance). Much nonsense has been talked, about Frau Stockar-Escher's "placing a suite of rooms at his disposal"; but it was purely a business transaction. An upper suite happening to be vacant just then, Wagner took it at its ordinary rent of 800f. a year, about £32. The rooms on the ground-floor had become too cramping for his needs, or rather, for his present need of comfort, and we have already seen him hunting for a cosy country residence instead (iii, 434); that idea had been knocked on the head by failure of the Berlin *Tannhäuser* negotiations, but the growing popularity of this work elsewhere quite justified some slight material expansion.

As to the new abode, which the Wagners entered about Easter, and where they remained four years—it was a bright and airy flat, with a row of windows looking on the Zeltweg, a main but not too busy thoroughfare. Apparently by Wagner's desire the doors separating its principal rooms from one another had been removed, and were now replaced by heavy curtains of dark green plush, the same material forming the window-hangings and covering the seats in the salon. A tiny anecdote is told about this garniture: Wagner had planned it as an agreeable surprise for his wife, and had it smuggled-in during a visit of Minna's to Winterthur; on her return she expressed nothing but horror at the fresh impost on the household budget, as "the old brown things were still quite usable"; to which her husband replied, "You might display a little pleasure!" With a view to the future, one can scarcely blame Minna; yet the additional outlay had been incurred as much to please *her* as himself;* for we find Wagner writing to F. Heine, Apr. 30, "Minna is happy in our fine new

* Cf. a letter to Uhlig of last September: "A fair has just been held in Zurich, and a foreign dealer brought such excellent and absurdly cheap linen to market, that the Wagner-pair could not resist the temptation to fulfil a long and vainly cherished wish, to renovate its worn-out and deplenished washing," thereby making a lamentable hole in the housekeeping purse for a while.

home," and in August to Fischer, "Luckily she can have her comforts now—thanks to Tannhäuser." To Liszt he had written Apr. 13, "You'll find everything quite spruce here; the luxury-imp has entered into me, and I've furnished my home as agreeably as possible. When the right thing lacks, one helps oneself as best one can"; and to Frau Ritter shortly after, "Of late I have quite a craze for luxury. Yet those who can realise what it has to replace for me, will doubtless think me very moderate." What it was to replace, is easy to divine: freedom of movement and *active* commune with his art. The consequences also we may guess, but may defer to the end of the year (cap. V), as Wagner himself did.

The present extravagance cannot have been so terribly great, however, since this is how Liszt notices it: "Wagner is very well housed, and has given himself some handsome furniture—among other pieces a couch, or rather, sofa, and a small fauteuil in green velvet. He goes in for maintaining a certain air of luxury, but very moderate in its way" (to Carolyne, July 3, '53). The sofa was in reality a broad divan that stood in the master's study; seemingly a peculiarity of his requirements, as we find it still repeated thirty years hence in his last dwelling-place, at Venice. Has anybody ever reflected that it may have been a *physiological* requirement? The man who so often cried aloud for bodily ease, suffered from a chronic malady that necessitated the wearing of a truss (never properly adjusted, according to the statement of his last physician). And bodily unrest, combined with nerve-strain, —undiagnosed eye-strain, as I shall shew hereafter—may account for the conversion of the suite of rooms into one unimpeded corridor, obedient to that need of frequent walking so constantly apparent in his letters. "Agitation or prostration: never peaceful rest," he once complains: in those words we have the history of this twofold provision.

The present yielding to the little "luxury-imp" was inspired, as said, by a reasonable hope of good returns from the earlier operas. One minor and second-rank city after another had either produced or cast its eye on *Tannhäuser*, and the clouds seemed to be finally lifting. The most profitable theatres stood stubbornly aloof, however, or even strewed obstacles in the way. Thus we have the second act of the Berlin comedy presented at the very time that Wagner was cheerfully embellishing his new abode.

Gustav Schöneck you will remember as the "talented young conductor" at the Zurich theatre in 1851-2 who had enthusiastically assisted Wagner with the *Holländer* performances there. He had since been engaged by Franz Wallner, a touring operatic manager, and they had already produced *Tannhäuser* at Freiburg in Breisgau, on the borders of the Black Forest. No sooner had three representations been given to a crowded house within a fortnight, than the Freiburg theatre-committee forbade the work to be repeated, some of the members disliking it (*N. Zft*, March 25, '53). After this arbitrary prohibition, Wallner and Schöneck struck their tent, and planned a descent on Berlin, taking one or two smaller places en route. Kroll's theatre was their objective, and their intention to give *Tannhäuser* at that home of vaudevilles for a couple of months. In the *Neue Zeitschrift* of April 29 we hear a first rumour of this project, and May 2 Wagner sends Schöneck a long list of stipulations, artistic and otherwise. Notwithstanding that Wagner has aptly called it (in a missing letter) a case of "Mirabeau as *marchand de draps*," Liszt thoroughly approves the plan—"Bravo Schöneck, and vivat Kroll's theatre"—though he writes on May 19 that it is variously regarded by his friends, whilst he himself had been asked to take Director Wirsing's Leipzig opera-company to the Königsstädter theatre in Berlin for a rival representation, but had naturally declined.

So everything is arranged for storming the Prussian capital, when the Royal Intendance suddenly improvises a new decree, forbidding performances of "grand operas" at any but the Royal Court-theatre. Considering that it was the fault of von Hülsen himself, or rather, of a hidden power behind him, that *Tannhäuser* had not been mounted at the Court establishment some months before (iii, 386), the trick was rather shady. Wagner thus comments on it to Liszt May 30: "Here we see how a mere threat has acted on these people; they're ashamed of themselves, and dread letting things come to a public rebuke. I have authorised Schöneck to announce Tannhäuser as a '*Singspiel*,' but he doubts himself that the affair can come off now. *He* will thus lose a fine opportunity of distinguishing himself and quitting his round of holes and corners; *I* lose a nice profit for this summer, since the enterprise would have brought me in a couple of thousand francs. As God, or rather, as Herr von Hülsen wills! In our beautiful States, you see, the Other element has the upper hand to-day; and the

P^ss of Prussia may wish and will as much as she pleases, she'll neither conquer That, nor certainly Herr von Hülsen—*I know it too well!!*"

The transparent ruse of announcing *Tannhäuser* as a "Singspiel" would undoubtedly have proved of no avail, but before the summer is out we hear that Schöneck has detached himself from his manager, since "Wallner was not complying with the conditions agreed as to presentation of the whole."* So the Kroll's theatre project falls to the ground of itself, and the Berliners lose all chance of hearing *Tannhäuser* yet awhile; though a concert-performance at Kroll's, mooted by conductor Engel, is also discussed between Wagner and Liszt in September, but promptly abandoned on artistic grounds.—It may be added, that Wallner and Schöneck had produced the opera at Posen, May 25, and "given it 4 times in six days, to the highest possible takings" (W. to L., June 14); also at Bromberg "with incredible success. All tickets for the two next performances are already sold out" (*N. Zft* Aug. 19).

In pursuit of a Berlin shadow we have outrun the date of Wagner's special Zurich concerts; so we will find our way back with a couple of sentences written to Roeckel June 8, after the festival was over: "You will wonder how I could have brought myself to give such a selection from my operas at a 'concert'? The thing is very easily explained, however. I was positively dying to hear something from *Lohengrin* for once, especially the orchestral prelude. To get the needful band together, I had of course to think of a whole evening's performance, and therefore to

* Wagner to Liszt, Letter 121 in the *Correspondence;* undated, but presumably of the early part of August, as Letters 121 to 124 need rearrangement.—The *Neue Zeitschrift* of June 24, '53, contains a letter from Director Wallner which already betrays friction with Schöneck, and is otherwise of interest as attesting that five performances of *Tannhäuser* had by then been given at Posen to "over-full and enthusiastic houses." Schöneck is one of those young men forced into ephemeral prominence by temporary connection with Wagner, then vanishing as suddenly from the scene. Wagner's letters of March 9 and June 10 to F. Heine, May 29 and July 5 to Schindelmeisser, and June 14 to Liszt, deal with this budding conductor at some length; from the last we gather that the master would not eventually have trusted Schöneck with the Berlin stage-production without some such supervisor as Carl Ritter.

give several other pieces of mine as well." It was no caprice of the composer's, nor a device for gaining either fame or money, but part and parcel of the great work that lay before him: ere he could set his musical "bell swinging again," he must attune himself to the vibrations of his latest work of tone. At the end of 1851 we met with precisely the same desire, expressed in precisely the same language (iii, 283): then he had but just conceived the plan of his tetralogy; now its poem has but just been printed. The only difference is, that then the concert-scheme was soon frustrated by the apathy of his surroundings, whereas he is enabled now to rouse those surroundings to adequate practical interest. The *Tannhäuser* overture and *Holländer* week of 1852 had accomplished that, at least, for him.

So closely was the idea of this festival connected with the RING, that it was barely three days after completing his recital of its poem when Wagner sent his letter aforesaid (94 *ant.*) to the committee of the Zurich 'Panharmonic.' The older members shook their heads, but the two youngest, Meyer-Stadler and Moritz von Wyss, gradually succeeded in beating down all opposition. Without their dogged perseverance the proposal would perhaps have failed as dismally as that of 1851; and it should be remarked that both of these young champions followed a profession (that of Law) which had nothing in itself to do with music—a common experience in the spread of Wagner's art, where lack of hall-marked prejudice has always been the first essential. That it took v. Wyss and Stadler some little time to inspire their colleagues with the necessary courage, is proved by the date of appearance of the following double advertisement in the local papers, exactly *six* weeks later than the artist's offer of February 22. On the fifth of April 1853 the linked appeal was published:—

MUSICAL PERFORMANCE.

The wish to make local friends of art more closely acquainted with my musical compositions has prompted me to bring a suitable selection of characteristic tone-pieces from all my operas to hearing at a specially prepared grand musical performance. As my aim, however, is purely artistic, and cannot be attained unless the proposed execution is sufficiently perfect, I can engage in this undertaking only on condition that the sympathy of local amateurs is so unusually insured me in advance that the very high cost of procuring the requisite artistic means shall thereby appear to be covered. Therefore, as the under-

taking—though springing from a wish of my own—is only to be achieved through local friends of art also evincing their desire for it, I make its pursuance exclusively dependent on the activity of that desire. In this sense I have already to congratulate myself on having won the friendliest promise of most strenuous support on the part of the honoured Musikgesellschaft of Zurich ; so that I am enabled from henceforth to consign the whole business side of the undertaking, with its by no means small difficulties, to their auspicious management.

All needful further commerce with the public, so far as concerns the making possible of my artistic project, I therefore transfer to the kind care of the honoured Musikgesellschaft ; and content myself with a general appeal to the sympathy of Zurich friends of art, to bring to pass an undertaking that on my part has no manner of object other than to do my best to offer an art-enjoyment.*

ZURICH, April 2, 1853. RICHARD WAGNER.

The Allgemeine Musikgesellschaft of this city, while expressing its sincere pleasure in supporting the performance proposed by Herr Kapellmeister Richard Wagner, desires to state that the same can only be compassed by calling in a considerable number of artists from outside, who will have to make an eight to ten days' stay in Zurich for the needful rehearsals and a twofold repetition. For this purpose, as also for travelling expenses, hire of the theatre, with no trifling amount of carpentry to accommodate the band on the stage, lighting and other charges, a sum of six to seven thousand francs will be required. Accordingly, though this undertaking has purely an artistic object, and no sort of profit is intended, it cannot be pursued unless the necessary sum, or at least the greater part thereof, be assured by subscriptions in advance.

The undersigned committee has consequently arranged that the performances, which are meant to take place on the 18th, 20th and 22nd May at 6.30 in the evening, may be previously signed for, either singly or to embrace all three. The subscription-lists will be exposed in the Music-room on Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday, the 12th, 13th and 15th of April, from 10 to 12 o'clock ; and Herr Theatre-cashier Keller, to whom orders may also be franked until the 15th April at latest, will receive the signatures. It will depend on the amount of the subscription, whether this Music-festival can be held or not. The performance of compositions of the gifted master's not yet known here, by a select orchestra and chorus under his own control, may certainly be regarded as a rare and exceptional feast.

ZURICH, April 2, 1853.

CONCERT-COMMITTEE OF THE ALLGEMEINE MUSIKGESELLSCHAFT.

---

* One of those formal manifestoes of Wagner's which are as much the despair of the translator as they must have been a torture to himself.

The subscription-list, when duly exposed, brought in no more than 4000f. (£160), not quite half the ultimate expenses—which, according to letters of Wagner's to three several correspondents, amounted to 9000f. The concert would therefore have fallen through, after all, had it not been that a private guarantee, started by the society itself, was promptly set on foot. Although the names of only two or three of the contributors have any meaning for us, this private list is so short that it may as well be recorded in full *: Ott-Imhof, Ott-Usteri, M. Escher-Hess, Bodmer-Stocker, H. Escher-Zollikofer, Dr Alfred Escher, Aloys von Orelli, J. Sulzer and Otto Wesendonk. To the last two supporters we should not be far wrong in attributing the lion's share, though Wagner himself alludes to this guarantee, or perhaps to the broader subscription, as follows: "Whoever knows our good Zurich, with its thoroughbred fogies and philistines, must be filled with amaze at this fact; and for my part I cannot deny that this proof of unexampled confidence and unusual affection has touched me very much" (to Roeckel, June 8). It *was* a tidy sum to club together, for those days; but—did Wagner himself make up the 2000f. difference between estimated and final costs? To Schindelmeisser he writes May 29, "My festival has cost me a pretty penny!"

The raising of money was but half the battle: the orchestra also had literally to be found, and through the concert-giver's own exertions. Out of seventy required (? 72), only 14 really eligible bandsmen could be mustered in all Zurich. Even before the subscription-list is publicly opened, Wagner begins his negotiations with the outer world, as may be seen in a letter dated Apr. 12 to bandmaster Petzold of Zofingen, inquiring after "good musicians" in that neighbourhood or Solothurn, and referring to "the great difficulty of assembling a complete, large and good orchestra here." To F. Heine also, the last of the month, "I am over my ears in traffic about my performances; my band I am drawing from Switzerland, France and Germany. O the correspondence!" From Berne, Basle, St Gallen, Winterthur, Schaffhausen, Solothurn, Biel, Lausanne, Thun, Zofingen, Chaux-de-fonds, Muri, he draws them; and beyond that, from Freiburg

* Herr Steiner, from whose brochure I have borrowed the list, with many another particular, remarks on the curious fact that most of these gentlemen belonged to the Conservative party.

i. B., Wiesbaden, Frankfort, Mayence, Stuttgart and Weimar. Invitations had been sent to Munich also, and solemnly accepted; but, Court-conductor Franz Lachner objecting (cf. vol. iii), a week or so before the actual performance Wagner is taken aback by a message that "leave for Switzerland has been refused" the Munich bandsmen,* and Petzold is appealed to once more, at the eleventh hour (May 12), to bring with him "a good contrabassist, owing to an unexpected withdrawal."

The ultimate constitution of the orchestra may be inferred from the following remark to Liszt: "I had almost nothing but band-masters and leaders: twenty quite excellent violins, eight violas, eight capital violoncelli and five double-basses. All had brought their best instruments with them, and, backed by a sounding-board constructed after my orders, the orchestra sounded uncommonly clear and fine." One detail remains sharp in the conductor's memory for another six years; writing Liszt in 1859, to recommend the "trombone-genius" Thiele of Berne for a vacant post at Weimar, he says: "At my famous Zurich concerts he truly won my heart. By his side he had two most feeble players, yet he managed so to infect them with his energy that at their entry in the Wedding-music one might fancy oneself listening to a whole army of trombonists."—As for the chorus, variously estimated at 100 to 150, it naturally consisted of amateurs chosen from the numerous vocal unions in Zurich and its environs: "I rehearsed these jog-trot four-part beings to such a pitch that they sang at last as if the Devil had entered their bodies." Energy, energy, from beginning to end.

Concurrently with the choral rehearsals, and just before the full ones, there was the public itself to be coached. Though the concert-programme was composed of almost purely "lyric" numbers (*vid. inf.*), it was far from the poet's intention that the dramatic aspect of his works should be entirely lost from sight. So Wagner reads the poems of the *Dutchman*, *Tannhäuser*, and *Lohengrin* to a freely-invited, non-paying audience in the Zurich Casino the week before the festival—a pendant to his reading of the RING three months ago. The *Eidgenössische Zeitung* of May 16 reports the event as follows:—"In preparation for the grand musical per-

* See the *Allg. Musikzeitung* 1885, pp. 221-2, for correspondence on this affair with A. Willozewsky, a member of the Munich orchestra.

formance to take place this week, Richard Wagner has read aloud his three beautiful operas in a course of three evenings. The size of his audience, increasing with each of these really extraordinary recitals, has proved what a lively interest is taken in the poet and his works. Endowed with a splendid, full and mellow voice, the elastic pliancy whereof responds to every nuance of expression, from the tenderest gentleness to the most ungovernable passion, Wagner delivered his artworks with an inspiration, feeling, and dramatic animation, that carried the audience almost to the illusion of a physical portrayal."

Beyond the recitals, there remained another, and a well-tried means of inducting his prospective hearers into the secrets of the music set before them. "I have just been writing an explanatory programme for my musical performances, and could not miss the opportunity of taking another glance at your essay on my operas. How it touched my heart again! When has an artist—a friend—ever done for another what you have done for me?!" (to Liszt, May 9). To these concerts we accordingly owe the well-known "Explanatory Programmes" for the overture to the *Flying Dutchman* and prelude to *Lohengrin* (see *P.* III.); that for the *Tannhäuser* overture had appeared last year (see vol. iii). In addition to these and the text of the vocal pieces, a few sentences made clear the dramatic purport of the other numbers.

The actual selection differs from the scheme proposed in '51 merely in that it includes the so-called 'March' from *Tannhäuser*. Here is the form in which it is announced to Liszt, March 3: "My plan is to give the people here, who also would like to hear a little of my music, a characteristic selection of pieces (not dramatic, but purely lyric) from my operas.

INTRODUCTION

'Peace March from Rienzi.'

then:

I. '*Fliegender Holländer*'
   - A. Senta's Ballad.
   - B. Sailors' song (C major).
   - C. Overture.

II. '*Tannhäuser*'
   - A. Entry of Guests at Wartburg.

B. Tannhäuser's Pilgrimage (i.e. introduction to the third act—entire—and with programme). To follow it, Chant of the returning Pilgrims (E flat major).

C. Overture.

III. '*Lohengrin*'

A. Instrumental Prelude.

B. The whole mens'-chorus scene from act two, beginning with the Turret-call (*Thürmerlied*), which will sound (D major) immediately the grand A major Prelude has died away, and thus lead down from heaven to earth.—This will connect (through a special transitional passage) with Elsa's Bridal Progress (with a special close —E flat major).

C. Wedding-music (Introduction to the third act). Bridal song—then Wedding-music repeated (G major). That ends it." *

This programme is in itself a little work of art, most skilfully constructed with a view not only to coherence, but also to light and shade. A marked peculiarity will strike the reader, namely the placing of the overtures to the *Dutchman* and *Tannhäuser* at the *end* of their respective sections; an admirable arrangement for the concert-room in their case. For the performance itself these pieces were not only accompanied by the printed "explanations" aforesaid, but each had a new descriptive title conferred on it, "Des Holländers Seefahrt: Ouverture" ("The Dutchman's Voyage") and "Der Venusberg: Ouverture"; whilst the *Lohengrin* prelude, the first item in *its* section, is denoted "Der heilige Gral: Orchester-Vorspiel," and the introduction to act iii of *Tannhäuser* (restored to its entirety for concert-purposes) simply "Tannhäuser's Bussfahrt." This we learn from an elaborate

* Again to Liszt, May 30: "I made a special, very effective new close for the 'Bridal Progress,' which I must let you have. After the 'Bridal song'—with a brief transition—I repeated the G major prelude (Wedding music), and gave this also a new close of its own." July 15: "The new score of the Lohengrin pieces (containing all the alterations) will be copied out in a month; so I need not send you the separate strips of paper that supply the links"—Liszt being about to repeat these pieces at the Carlsruhe festival (see next chapter). Two or three details as to rendering are also given in Letters 130 and 133, Sept. '53.

India-ink copy of the list of pieces, bristling with ornamental letters, preserved in the Programme-book of the Zurich musical society. Headed "Musical performance at the theatre on the 18th, 20th and 22nd of May 1853. Composition and Direction by Richard Wagner," at its foot this copy bears an official note: "At the above performance there worked an orchestra of 70 artists, assembled at the master's call from far and near, and a mixed choir of 100 voices. The solo parts were taken by Madame Heim and Herren Castalli and Pichon.* In this dramatic-musical production Zurich has found the climax of its previous art-delights; and what now fills the Present with high enthusiasm, will also rouse Posterity to admiration. The name of Richard Wagner shines as a star of first magnitude in the musical firmament, and never will it set!"

An official Programme-book is scarcely the place where we should have looked for such prophetic insight. All honour, therefore, to these worthy Zurich burghers! so much in advance of Paris and London, at least in good intention. A like fervour of appreciation is displayed in the *Eidgenössische* reports, even when purged (as below) of a fair share of their rhetoric:—

May 19, 1853.

Richard Wagner's Music-festival.—As princes celebrate their proud court-festivals, so we celebrated yesterday a music-festival the splendour whereof might have excited the envy of every Residenz in Europe. We, also, have a King in our midst to gladden us; but his kingdom is of Art. It was a truly inspiriting spectacle, when one entered the brilliantly-lit theatre and saw the whole stage occupied with the most superb orchestra, extending right up to the flies; 70 bandsmen and a choir of 110 voices . . . On a little raised platform in front of this orchestra stood the man whose magic wand all willingly obeyed . . [Rhapsody on the various pieces.] . . What an endless variety of emotions, what contrasts, what a storehouse of delight! Wagner's music is a miracle of conception and treatment; yet the wonders of its form are but the most appropriate expression for the inmost marvels of the human heart. And thus was the whole house spellbound by the wonders of this night. Such a jubilation we have

* Frau Emilie Heim, whom we shall meet from time to time hereafter, rendered Senta's Ballad. Castalli (the second vowel in his name is not quite legible) can only have sung the little solo passages for the Steersman in the Sailors' Chorus. Pichon, who played the Holländer last year (vol. iii), must have now been given the Herald's part in the scene from act ii of *Lohengrin*.

seldom witnessed in our theatre ; each number was loudly applauded ; at the close the master was tumultuously called, and loaded with wreaths, bouquets and acclamations, by audience, bandsmen and singers alike. That moment, and the hearing of the music to his noble "Lohengrin" for the first time in his life, may have richly recompensed him for the days of toil and sleepless nights he had endured in preparing so great a pleasure for Zurich. Nor will Zurich ever be unmindful of those days bestowed by him. Thanks for them, sincere and heartfelt thanks. Thanks also to the musicians [and so on].

May 21, 1853.

On the second festival evening Wagner's muse achieved a second brilliant triumph. The house was full to bursting, and received the master with exultant applause, while a triple Tusch thundered out from the whole orchestra ; a tribute to the rare trifolium of poet, composer and conductor, so splendidly combined in Wagner's personality. Once more the musical wonder-work, a summary of Wagner's artistic evolution itself, entranced all hearts by its perfection. With every number the jubilation increased, until in "Lohengrin," undoubtedly the crown of Wagner's creations, it broke into enthusiasm unparalleled before. Audience, bandsmen and singers vied with each other in proffering the master their gratitude and admiration.—It will be necessary to give a fourth performance, if all who desire it are to partake of this feast. Among the audience yesterday were many guests from neighbouring Swiss towns and Chur in particular.

May 23, 1853.

Last night, the last night of the festival, set the crown on the earlier ones. With repeated hearing of these tone-works has waxed their understanding, and with it the enthusiasm for them. Besides the breezy Sailors' chorus from the "Holländer," it was the music from "Lohengrin" that again produced the noblest, tenderest, above all, the most powerful and lasting impression. When the last vibrations of the Wedding-feast, and therewith of the sumptuous music-feast, died out, wreaths and bouquets came flying from all sides, the whole house hurrahed, and the bandsmen joined in with their Tusch. A singer [W. Niedermann by name] advanced and recited a poem [attached to one of the wreaths] worthily lauding the exertions of the highly-gifted man ; the prettiest of the ladies offered a laurel-wreath, which the master modestly declined to have set on his brow ; and a second lady [daughter of Alex. Müller] presented him with a silver goblet in name of the feminine singers. Quite overcome by so many proofs of love and veneration, their object could utter no more than the words, "What great and touching gladness you have given

me to-day!"—it chanced [?] to be his fortieth birthday. Then all dispersed. . . .

Before dispersal there also came a souvenir from Wagner's side. Each active participator in the festival received a manifolded copy of the following three themes, written out and signed by the composer:

"*Aus dem fliegenden Holländer.*

BALLADE DER SENTA.



Aus Tannhäuser.

PILGERGESANG.



Aus Lohengrin.

BRAUTLIED.

Zur Erinnerung an den 18, 20 *und* 22 *Mai* 1853.

RICHARD WAGNER."

Regarding the extraordinary perfection and universal success of these concerts we further have the testimony of Herwegh's wife, whom we have already found to be no personal worshipper of Wagner. In that *Gegenwart* article briefly dealt with last chapter she is quoted as expressing herself thus (apparently to the writer, as we are not informed when and where): "Wagner's effect on his band and choir was electrifying, and to myself the artistic result was the more astonishing as the wonderful ensemble

of the Paris Conservatoire orchestra under Habeneck's command was still fresh in my memory. It amazed me, that a conductor should succeed in attaining so unique an art-achievement with forces in many respects weak and mostly amateur; whoever attended these unforgettable performances, must have imagined himself listening to none but executants of the very first rank. The enthusiasm of the audience also was so great, that one of the least art-loving in the circle of our friends went the round of the boxes during the intervals, accompanied by a servant with a linen-basket full of the choicest flowers, and had his offering of splendid bouquets cast thence on the stage. Wagner's triumph was overwhelming past dispute."

The silver goblet presented May 22 was the first public token of its kind ever received by our hero.* To inaugurate it, he gave a little party in his rooms on the 24th, with Sulzer, Hagenbuch, Baumgartner, A. Müller and daughters, and Ignaz and Emilie Heim, as guests. That had been preceded, however, by a public banquet at the Casino, to entertain Wagner and the visiting bandsmen, between the second and third concerts, when Ott-Usteri, president of the Allg. M.-Gft, proposed the chief toast in a speech ending thus: "His latest work had never been heard by the author himself with the outward ear. But you, Gentlemen, have obeyed the prophet's summons, and will return from his sanctuary with joyful belief in his hymn. His splendid tone-works have been set before us in the order of their origin, and ever finer, ever purer in form, ever richer in spirit, ever more sublime in emotion, have they proved themselves, till we reached the summit of this musical world of wonders in the Bridal procession from 'Lohengrin,' where every man of feeling must be touched to tears. And now all our thoughts concentre in reverence and admiration for the great master whose praises, Gentlemen, you soon will carry everywhere . . . With heartiest wishes for his future labours, rise, Gentlemen, and join me in the toast: Herr Richard Wagner hoch!"

Such ovations were something entirely new in their recipient's experience; but they were not to pass without one tiny jarring

* It was quickly followed by a "Lohengrin" snuffbox from Wiesbaden (see Letters 119 and 121, *W.-L.*), where that opera had its première July 2, '53, under Louis Schindelmeisser—see Appendix.

note, sounded by the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, which opined that Wagner must be praying for rescue from his friends and their "excessive homage." There is a little to be said for that view, no doubt, and we ourselves have been constrained to omit some of the high-flown phrases of the *Eidgenössische;* but the opposition paper forgot that it is the most difficult thing in the world, to praise with distinction when the object of praise is so high above your common plane. Its own half-satirical efforts are worth reproducing, nevertheless, as corroborative historic evidence :—

May 23.—Yesterday Richard Wagner's third musical performance took place. Every ticket was sold out, as a number of visitors had poured in from distant parts, and the steamboat had announced an extra journey. Even this mass of human beings, orchestra and audience uniting to form a vast amphitheatre, made an imposing effect. The applause was as extraordinary as before. The Sailors' song was encored; at the close the great master was pelted with wreaths and saluted with a declamation that greeted him as the herald of a freer age ; a ceremony which Wagner very simply answered with a word of hearty thanks and a pressure of the prima donna's hand. As to his qualifications, we leave the experts to speak ; for ourselves we have recognised thus much, that the peculiarity does not reside in the method, but in the individuality of this man. We doubt, moreover, that he will ever have a school to copy him.

One thing particularly struck us, in Wagner's music : it can be everything but *gay*. In its mirth there is always a blend of the uncanny ; in its bluest sky there hangs a cloud one feels to be fraught with lightning to founder some ship. To us it almost seems as if Wagner meant to write our recent history with his music.

Wagner's own accounts I have kept to the last, that we might approach them with a clearer idea of his outward position. "I am very tired and knocked up," he writes Liszt on May the 30th. "Damm will probably have already told you all about my performances.* Everything went off capitally, and Zurich is amazed that such a thing could have come about. The philistines are wellnigh carrying me on their hands, and if I set any store upon outward success, I ought to be satisfied over and over again with the effect of my concerts. You know, however, that my chief object was to hear something from Lohengrin, and in particular

* A young bandsman lent by Weimar : "Damm has told us wonders about your 3 performances," answers Liszt, June 8.

the orchestral prelude. Well, that has interested me above all else. The effect on myself was uncommonly moving; I had to pull myself together by force, not to give way to it! Thus much is certain: I entirely share your preference for Lohengrin; 'tis the best thing I have done as yet. Upon the audience, too, the same effect was manifest: in spite of the Tannhäuser-overture preceding them, the pieces from Lohengrin were almost unanimously given the palm . . . The Bridal-progress and Wedding-music were enormously popular; every one went into raptures. Indeed it was a festival for the little world around me: the women are all in my favour.——If I had repeated the concert six times more, it would have been full every time . . . The total expenses amounted to 9000 francs! What do you say to our burghers having provided that sum? I really believe I may bring something quite untold to pass, in time, here. For the present, it has cost me quite untold exertions."

To F. Heine, June 10: "My music-festival was splendid, and has given me great hopes of accomplishing unheard-of things here in the future. Certainly I shall present my operas, and the Nibelungen also, here some day. I shall need Wilhelm for that, as ever [F. H.'s son, see vol. iii]: in 3 to 4 years Wilm must come to Switzerland: write him that, to Japan. . . . The pieces from *Lohengrin* pleased the most here. The prelude affects me very much." To Fischer, June 15: "My music-festival was undoubtedly fine; a purer and more cheering impression I have *never* yet experienced." And more explicitly, as regards the future, to Roeckel on the 8th: "The performances were perfect, and their success gains more and more significance for Switzerland. For I have no doubt that the means will be furnished me here, some day, to bring my dramatic compositions to a representation after my own heart. Naturally that will mean my devoting myself for a series of years exclusively to the training of a body of performers such as I need: once I've done that to my satisfaction, I shall produce all my works, and in particular my Nibelungen-dramas, in a specially constructed theatre, lightly but suitably built—and thus attain, if not precisely my ideal, at least as much of it as lies within the power of a solitary man. First, however, I have to gird up all my strength and health—which often is very ailing—to carry out the musical composition of my Nibelungen dramas. That will take me, say 3 to 4 years?"

Thus is Wagner's Music-festival of May '53 demonstrably associated with the Stage-festival scheme propounded in September '50, but not to be actually achieved till August '76. Even as it stands, the vista is no brief one: "three to four years" for completion of the RING music, and *after* that a "series of years" for the training of a special company. In itself it was a longish glance into the future—and more—an immensely over-sanguine glance. Supposing the music for the tetralogy had actually been completed by 1858, let us say, the guarantee just raised by the good Zurich burghers would have needed multiplication by at least fifty (the Bayreuth theatre and representation cost 150-fold) to ensure anything like a decent production. Would their enthusiasm, or that of all Switzerland, have risen to such a pitch within the term proposed? To be just, no sober-minded person could have expected it of them. But genius would not be genius, were it sober-minded in its hopes.

The festival was followed by two epilogues, an unpleasant and a pleasant one. First comes the unpleasant (for fuller details see Appendix to vol. ii). On June the 2nd the *Deutsche Allgemeine* published the programme of the Zurich concert of ten days previously, adding the injudicious and wholly unfounded remark that Wagner proposed to "bring forward these 'characteristic examples' of his music in several German cities, also, by degrees." That was enough for the vigilant Beust, even had it not been coupled with news of the concert-giver's great personal triumph. Choosing to regard the composer as nothing but a demagogue with the most sinister designs, the Saxon police at once renewed the warrant of arrest, in an aggravated form, and published it in their list of "politically dangerous individuals" with a portrait and the warning that Wagner "is said to be intending to set out for Germany," thus dealing a crushing blow at Liszt's diplomatic efforts in his friend's behalf (cap. IV).

The news is conveyed to Liszt, and by him to Wagner, in an anonymous letter from Dresden, one sentence of which must be cited as a sign of the times: "Though personally acquainted with Herr Kapellmstr R. Wagner in former days, I do not know how to convey this information to him, as most letters to refugees in Switzerland are said to be broken open, if not lost entirely." A similar fear is expressed by young Bülow: just starting on his

first concert-tour in February of this year, he writes his father, "Perhaps it will be better for you to address your letters for me to Liszt at Weimar, so that people in Vienna may not suspect me of correspondence with Switzerland. To Wagner I don't think of writing *at all*, and shall keep a strict surveillance on myself;" whilst his mother writes her daughter, "There is no question that Hans will be specially watched by the police, and one must write him as little and as *uncompromisingly* as possible; for letters such as Papa sometimes sends you both might bring him to a fortress, particularly just now." In all the larger German States the full tide of Reaction had lately set in, under the constellation of the "Bundestag," and their various systems of police played merrily into one another's hands. Even Weimar could not escape the lethal influence long, for next year Alexander Ritter—newly-married to Wagner's niece Francisca, and just settling down to the duties of a first violinist in the court-orchestra—was reported to the Saxon authorities for an inquiry into his antecedents: answer came from Dresden to the effect that he was a most suspicious and dangerous individual, since he was 1) a Russian by birth, and 2) belonged to a family whose subversive associations were beyond all doubt, as it had the effrontery materially to support Richard Wagner, a political refugee under warrant of arrest.*

This epilogue we may round off with an observation of Liszt's, from a letter to Wagner dated Frankfort, July 12, '53: "In your entirely *non-political* attitude neither of the two persons to whom I have spoken about it as yet [was E. Devrient one?] would consent to believe. It will take a little time, before people arrive at a juster estimate of your relations and your whole individuality."

The second epilogue, the pleasant one, had a certain connection with the first, namely as a popular protest against such stubborn persecution. Its ostensible object was the presentation to Wagner of diplomas of honorary membership of the two

* Frau Ritter writes her son Oct. 8, '54: "The worst of it is, these slanders have been reported to the Russian embassy, where they really might do us harm. Let us hope they will be received there for what they are worth: perhaps our diplomats will understand that one can be fond of Wagner's music, without being guilty of high treason. That seems to be too high a flight for the German police" (F. Rösch, "Alexander Ritter," *Mus. Wochenblatt* 1898, p. 175).

principal vocal unions that had taken part in the late festival, the Stadtsängerverein and the Harmonie (of the Allg. M.-Gft he had been made hon. member two years before). Facing his windows on the Zeltweg a substantial platform had been erected, to accommodate a band and singers, and on the evening of July 13 the whole broad thoroughfare filled with an expectant crowd, though rain was lightly falling. A torchlight procession, with band-playing, opened the proceedings; next followed a chorus of Baumgartner's. Then the president of the Stadtsängerverein, Prof. Karl Keller, delivered a long speech, extolling the master as "reformer of art" etc., and expressing the hope that "he, *whom his own fatherland casts out*, may long abide the joy and pride of all in beautiful free Switzerland." That was from the platform. Wagner replied from his window, "in a simple conversational tone," saying that, "little as he deserved the distinction, he hoped to prove himself worthy of a recognition that had nowhere been accorded him in such measure as at Zurich," and promising to "surprise the public ere long with something quite out of the common,"*—another indication of his proposal to get his *Nibelungen* theatre built in Zurich's neighbourhood some day. The serenade was brought to a close with the Sailors' Chorus from the *Dutchman*.

Once more the master's own account is raciest and best. To Liszt he writes July 15: "On Wednesday evening my Zurichers made an attempt to dispel my grey dumps with their torches. It was quite a pretty ovation; nothing like it, at least, had happened to myself in all my life. An orchestra had been built in front of my house: at first I believed they were erecting a scaffold for me. They played and sang—speeches were exchanged, and Hoch's were called me by a mass of people reaching far as eye could see. I wish you could have heard the set oration: it was uncommonly naïve and faithful of heart; I was hailed as a regular Messiah." So the same sense of humour that temporarily laughs away the exile's ban with a joke about a "scaffold" for his execution, can detect the honest naivety beneath a stilted phrase.

That torchlight serenade concludes the history of the only "Wagner concert" for seven years to come.

---

* From contemporary reports in the *Eidgenössische* and *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*.

IV.

LISZT'S VISIT.

Attempts to gain leave to visit Germany; Duke of Coburg (his opera), Weimar and Dresden; frustrated.—"Solitude" at Zurich; Wagner at the pianoforte.—Longing for Liszt: incidents of his eight-day visit.—Niece Johanna.—St Moritz 'cure'; depression; Italy and insomnia.—Carlsruhe Festival: Eduard Devrient; Liszt the organiser; von Bülow reappears; Pohl's brochure.—Salutation at Basle; to Paris with Liszt.—Liszt replaced by Minna; back home again.

Doch ich—bin so allein.
SIEGFRIED, act ii.

SINCE the period of the *Lohengrin* production at Weimar (1850) we have had little complaint from Wagner as to the hardships of expatriation until towards the end of 1852, when the sudden spread of *Tannhäuser* made him fret once more at the debarment from superintending any of its performances. The Saxon police were therefore not entirely misinformed when they assumed a *desire* on his part to revisit Germany, though it was ridiculous to speak of his "intention" in the manner related last chapter. As we shall hear next to nothing of any such desire for another three years, during which it is dropped as utterly hopeless, we will devote a few pages to its recent history.

It is in October '52 that the longing begins to be vocal, with the exclamation to Uhlig: "Something must happen, to tear me from this everlasting brain-life . . . How things are to be otherwise, I'm unable to conceive, since at no price can I petition for my amnesty! Yet I know that a trip to Weimar or Berlin, to hear my operas and do something practical for them, would have a very beneficial effect on me." That was half-way through the poem of *Rheingold*. Immediately on its completion he tells Liszt: "Of actual enjoyment of life I know nothing . . . My heart has had to pass into my brain, and my life to become a

mere artificial one . . . Could I but visit *you* in Weimar, attend a performance of my operas here or there, perhaps I still might hope to recover. I should find a stimulus to my artistic being: maybe a word of love would also sound from here or there;—but—here?! Here I must perish in the very briefest space, and everything—everything—will come *too late—too late!* . . . What's to be done, then? Am I to beg the King of Saxony—or rather, his ministers—for grace? to play the humble penitent? Who would ask *that* of me? . . . Yet thus much is certain: if Germany doesn't reopen to me very soon, if I have to continue without a fillip to my artistic existence, my animal instinct of life will drive me to *give up all art.*"

It was a terrible cry, moving Liszt to "bitter tears" and redoubled activity (witness the 'Wagner-week' of Feb. '53 at Weimar); but all he could counsel was "patience." And Wagner is patient, for a good three months—almost an eternity to him—till the poem of his RING at last is printed. Then he can bear the strain no longer: "Never was I so at one with myself about musical treatment, as I am now and regarding this poem. I lack but the needful *vitalising*, to arrive at that indispensable serenity of spirit out of which the motives shall well forth gladly of themselves.—On this point I have once already poured my bitter plaint into your ear: I craved redemption from the killing plight in which I find myself at Zurich; I asked if it were possible to get me permitted to make an occasional trip to Germany, to attend a performance of my works, as otherwise I must perish here of inanition. To your grief, you were able to answer me with nothing but a negative, and admonished me to—patience! Dear, noble friend, reflect that with patience one can sustain bare life at utmost: but strength and exuberance to enrich life and make it creative—no man has ever drawn from patience, i.e. from absolute *privation.* Neither will it succeed with me!—Listen! You are so very silent on this point. Do let me know if aught has ever been begun at Weimar, to obtain me from Dresden the leave to return into Germany, and what obstacles have haply been met there? Should everything not have been tried already, I would make the following suggestion: that the Court of Weimar invite me on a couple of weeks' visit to Weimar, make me out a month's pass for that purpose, and inquire at Dresden—through the ambassador—whether Saxony had anything

against it, or were likely to demand my extradition. If a reassuring answer followed, such as that the warrant issued 4 years since would be suspended for this little while, I could come to you in no time—hear my *Lohengrin*—and then return direct to Switzerland, there to await *your visit* (I could read my poem to the Court too!).—See what can be done in it!—I must hear *Lohengrin* for once: till then I can write no music any more" (Feb. 11, '53).

Liszt's "silence," as he himself protests (Feb. 20), had been far from that of indifference; "I have left nothing undone, that seemed to me opportune and lay in my power. Unfortunately, I have very faint hopes; yet hopes they are," of being able "to give you a definite, and D. V. a favourable answer in about six weeks, concerning your return." One of those hopes was evidently connected with the reigning Duke of Coburg-Gotha, Ernst II., brother-in-law of Queen Victoria. He had attended the Weimar production of the *Holländer* Feb. 16, as we learn from an intermediate letter of Liszt's (Feb. 18), which contains moreover the message to Wagner: "I want you to pay special attention to the postscript (with regard to Gotha) added by Hans to his letter of yesterday at my request. It is not yet time for me to go into details—and probably nothing will come of it; but in the event of your receiving a message direct from Coburg-Gotha, I beg you to give me full power to arrange this little business for you without further incommoding yourself." The key to this enigma is not to be found in the Wagner-Liszt letters, but the *Briefe hervorragenden Zeitgenossen an F. Liszt* supplies it as follows:—

Feb. 20 the Duke of Coburg writes Liszt: "I have just been handed your kind lines addressed to Lampert [the Duke's Kapellmeister], and am delighted at seeing that you are not disinclined to act as intermediary between myself and Kapellmeister Wagner." The missive then proceeds to a scrap of autobiography, very clearly and modestly narrated, its upshot being that this princely amateur has just commenced his fourth opera, on a text supplied by "the fat Birch,"* and wants a better 'ghost' than had served him for

* Frau Charlotte Birch-Pfeiffer, whom Wagner had recently polished off (unknown to the Duke, of course) with the satirical epithet "the Royal Prussian upper-court-poetess," in his *Theatre at Zurich* (P. III., 33).—The Duke's opera presumably was *Santa Chiara*, which Liszt rehearses for him at Gotha in March of next year.

his earlier ones: "I have already finished more than half of the first act; and the great question arises, as to the instrumentation. I have no fancy to entrust this difficult task to Lampert or an insignificant composer; whom better could one think of, than our talented Wagner? The only point is, whether he will be disposed to fit instrumentation to music-pieces otherwise complete, and, so to say, put the finishing touch to the work. To him it must be an easy thing, and if he did not want too many alterations I should be delighted to follow his advice.—So far as I hear, Wagner is but little occupied, and not in the most brilliant of circumstances. Perhaps it will be convenient to him, to earn 100 Ld'or in a few months; a fee that I gladly would pay him. All this, however, is subsidiary to the question whether it would please him, on the whole, to take part in a work that could not be allowed to bear his name. Vous comprenez bien ce qu'il y a de délicat dans cette question.—Albeit that I know Wagner, I believed I should be sure of attaining my object if I employed you, honoured friend, as intermediary."

Not the least interesting hint in the Duke of Coburg's letter is contained in that last sentence, pointing to a personal encounter whereof we hitherto knew nothing. When and where? Most probably at Eisenach just after Wagner's flight from Dresden (see vol. iii, 469), since one of the artist's letters to Liszt of June '49 suggests the Duke as a likely person to appeal to for pecuniary support in conjunction with the Grand Duchess of Weimar and her daughter the Princess of Prussia (a plan that came to nothing); whilst in July '50 Wagner seriously thinks it possible that the same prince might provide him with a pass for Weimar, to attend the *Lohengrin* production incognito (an idea most sensibly flouted by Liszt at once). Neither of these earlier proposals can have actually come to the Duke's ears; but what was the fate of his own present request? That it was declined, almost goes without saying; unfortunately, however, we are again faced with a gap in the Wagner-Liszt letters. Neither that in which Liszt conveyed the offer to Wagner, nor that in which Wagner conveyed (or enclosed?) his reply, nor that reply itself, has come down to us. All we have to go upon, is Liszt's letter of March 25:* "I

---

* Not quite all, to be precise; for in his article *On Operatic Poetry and Composition*, of 1879, Wagner half-jocosely refers to the incident: "An opera-composing German prince once desired friend Liszt to procure my aid in the

sent on your letter to the Duke of Coburg. He answers it in quite a kind and gracious manner, concluding with 'On verra ce qu'on pourra faire pour lui plus tard'; a remark I will not fail to discuss with the Duke on occasion. You surely have not the smallest doubt of my views on this affair; otherwise I should have to think you had taken leave of your senses. Certainly you could not regard the thing in any other way than you have done, and for that very reason I was bound to shew myself entirely passive and neutral." Whatever Wagner's answer to Duke Ernst—and had it not been decorous, Liszt would never have forwarded it—we may deduce from the above that the offer concerning his opera was *not* accepted. There was nothing precisely derogatory in such a proposal, coming from such a quarter, save for the concealment involved; whilst the terms were by no means unhandsome. But can one imagine the disastrous effect its execution might have had on Wagner's own creative work? With the Coburg-Gotha arias, and so on, still dinning his ears, still haunting every instrument in his mental orchestra, to settle down to the composition and scoring of *Rheingold!* It was out of the question.—So one of Liszt's faint hopes of diplomatic intervention is dashed: "We will see what can be done for him later." With the best will in the world, which we gladly accord him, the Duke of Coburg could have done absolutely nothing against the unbending will of the greater German powers.

Meanwhile Wagner writes Liszt, March 4, to clear up any possible misunderstanding of his object: "Should your titanic perseverance in the cause of a friend ever succeed in opening me a path to Germany, rest assured that I would use this privilege for no other purpose than to visit *Weimar*—off and on—take a brief share in your doings, and attend a decisive performance of my operas here or there. This I need—this is a necessary-of-life to me; and this it is—that I so cruelly lack at present! No other profit would I ever draw from it: never would I permanently fix myself in Germany, but adhere for my regular living-, or rather, working-place to this peacefully beautiful Switzerland, which, as Nature, has grown very dear to me. How little I now am equal

instrumenting of a new opera by his Highness; in particular he wanted the good effect of the trombones in 'Tannhäuser' applied to his work; apropos whereof my friend felt it his duty to divulge a secret, namely that something always occurred to me first, before I set it for the trombones."

to support the excitement attendant on a constant *public* appearance for any length, I am well aware: after every explosion—a positive necessity to me from time to time—I should require the most absolute quiet for creative work, such quiet as this place affords me without stint. A permanent occupation in Germany I therefore could never enter on again; nor would it at all agree with my views and experience.—On the other hand, an occasional excursion, for the objects aforesaid, is henceforth indispensable to me: 'tis the rain I need, if my plant is not to die of drought. I can live in nothing but extremes—the greatest activity and excitement—and the most perfect calm." Here the writer's temperament is summed up in a fashion that explains the whole of his life. The allusion to Switzerland also is significant, and still more so in light of the next letter: "In thought I am living almost solely with you, and ever absent from my present dwelling-place. The life I lead here is a life of dreams: if I wake, it is with pain. . . . A social intercourse that simply tortures me, and from which I withdraw but to torture myself.—Things can't go on like this!! I can bear this life no longer"—written but three days before drafting the preliminary advertisement of his Zurich festival (103-4 *ant.*).

The faith the writer reposes in his friend's diplomatic influence is altogether pathetic. March 30, in continuation of the words last-quoted: "I beg you now most *urgently:* incite the Court of Weimar to a definitive step, to ascertain once for all whether I have a certain prospect of return to Germany being soon and swiftly opened me. I *must* know this soon and for sure. Be regardlessly frank with me! Tell me if the Weimar court will take this step, and—if it takes it, and takes it quickly—what is its result.—I have no idea of demeaning myself in the slightest for sake of this wish: *you* I can assure that I shall remain entirely aloof from any sort of part in politics, and anyone not imbecile must perceive for himself that *I* am no demagogue, to be dealt with by the police. (For that matter, they can place me under police surveillance as much as they like!) Only, they must not demand of me the shame of any kind of contrite confession. . . . If nothing brings me a fresh breath of life—there's an end to it; rather than live on *thus*, I would commit suicide!"—From pathos we have arrived at tragedy, largely attributable to overwrought nerves, no doubt, but little suspected by the good Zurich friends, as we shall see.

On such occasions Liszt invariably rises to his full height.

"Your letters are sad—your life still sadder"—he answers (Apr. 8)—"but do you not feel that the thorn and wound you bear in your heart will quit you nowhere, and never, never can be healed?—Your greatness constitutes withal your misery—both are inextricably entwined, and perforce must rack and torture you—until you let them both ascend into *Belief!* 'Lass zu dem Glauben Dich neu bekehren, es gibt ein Glück . . .' and that is the only happiness, the true, eternal. I cannot preach it to you, cannot expound it: but to God will I pray, that He may illumine your heart with the power of His Faith and Love!—However bitterly you may deride this feeling, I cannot cease seeing and desiring in it the only weal. Through Christ, through suffering resignedly in the hand of God, shall we find our rescue and redemption." Wagner's answer to this heartfelt adjuration is equally instructive: "How could you so much as imagine that any of the outpourings of your great heart could rouse in me a 'scoff'!! The forms under which we seek our solace for unhappiness mould themselves entirely after our nature, our need, the character of our education, our more or less artistic sense: who could wish to be so loveless, as to believe the only valid form were that revealed to him? . . . He who himself yearns, hopes and believes, rejoices gladly in the hope and faith of others. . . . I, too, believe in a Beyond: though it lie beyond *my life*, it does not lie beyond *what* I can feel, think and comprehend; for I believe in *Men*—and need nothing further.—And at bottom of your heart, who shares my belief more than *you*—you who believe in me and give proofs of a love such as no man can have exercised before? Look you: you *realise* your faith in every moment of your life; therefore I *know* profoundly—in *what* it is that you believe; and could I ridicule the form from which a miracle like that pours forth? Truly, I should have to be less an—artist than I am, not to understand you with delight" (Apr. 13).

Opening direct on our path, the glimpse into the inner soul of two such men was not to be resisted; but it has diverted our attention from the matter more immediately in hand. "I have already indicated to you [in that missing letter?] that I expect no answer from Dresden before my departure from here"—continues Liszt, Apr. 8. "Should you tax me with remissness or lukewarmness, you would be doing me an injustice, though I cannot blame you. Were I to insist on a Yes or No, in the manner you desire, I

should gravely compromise your cause. The Court here is very favourably disposed to you, and you may rest assured that every possible step will be taken to pave your return to Germany. Only a few days back I spoke again to our Her^y Gd Duke, who told me outright that he will exert himself actively for you. I beg you to make no further use of it; but it will be as well for you to write the Her^y Gd Duke a letter, telling him that you have been informed through me of his magnanimous disposition, and begging him not to forget you. Don't write too diplomatically, but give a little play to your heart,—and send me the letter, which I will hand him at once."

To this Wagner answers: "My dearest, dearest friend, take it as no *reproach*, if I recently wrote you with furious impatience concerning my return to Germany! It was one of my lettings-off of steam: I cry when I feel pain, but I accuse nobody, and truly, you least of all! Simply, you have the misfortune to stand too close to me, and consequently hear all my moanings and groanings so grievously sharp. Don't let it ever vex you, but forgive me from your heart!—I shall write to the H^y Gd Duke, all the same, as a pleasure." That answer's date should be observed, namely April 13, the second day of the public subscription-list for the Zurich concerts: in the immediate prospect of "hearing something from *Lohengrin* at last" the eagerness for leave to take a trip to Germany has dropped into the background. And from that day till Liszt's visit not another hint does Wagner let fall on the subject.

Lucky for him, that he has resigned himself thus early; for Liszt's best efforts prove of no avail. May 19, from Weimar: "June 15 is the Jubilee of our Grand Duke—for which *H.M. the King of Saxony* will probably arrive here . . . By the middle of July, at latest, I shall be with you in Zurich . . . God grant I may bring you good news of Dresden; *just because of that* I must remain here till the end of June." His Majesty arrives somewhat earlier than expected, but with little benefit to Wagner, as Liszt writes young Bülow, June 8: "Their majesties the King and Queen of Saxony were most gracious to me at a small concert given last evening in the Goethe gallery. Unhappily there is very little prospect of obtaining speedy pardon for our friend"; and under the same date also to Wagner: "In honour of the King and Queen of Saxony there was a little court-concert

here the day before yesterday [?].—Other details I reserve for word of mouth.—Unfortunately I rather doubt that the steps taken will lead to the desired result—however, there is still one hope before my journey. The Hy Gd Duke is shortly going to Dresden, and has repeatedly promised me his earnest intercession in this matter." Those "other details" we may wellnigh fill in for ourselves, when we reflect that the Hy Gd Duke proposed to intercede in *Dresden* for what he had been unable to procure from the King of Saxony as his father's guest at Weimar: the King was powerless, even as to exercise of the royal prerogative of pardon; the Minister of the Interior and of Foreign Affairs, in one, dominated not only the Saxon Cabinet, but his sovereign-lord himself. And when the young Weimar prince arrived in Dresden (to attend a Court marriage), his personal intercession with Beust either was just a day or two too late, or actually precipitated a blow that neither artistic comrade, king, nor prince, could possibly avert. To stamp out every chance of royal yielding, the Saxon police were instructed to re-issue the ban against Wagner with aggravated accusation (115 *ant.*).—The more one thinks of it, the more preposterous it seems. If merely *punishment* were the object, for a political transgression relatively so insignificant (see vol. ii, 409), surely four years of outlawry already passed might be deemed sufficient for a dramatic composer. If *prevention*, the bare notion is absurd: as a "dangerous individual," i.e. one likely to abuse his liberty by starting a political campaign or joining in complots, the Saxon Ministry can never have seriously regarded Richard Wagner! Unless they simply meant to make a deterrent example of an otherwise prominent personage, their action is as incomprehensible as it certainly was tyrannous.

But how did the victim receive the tidings? His answer to the letter in which Liszt had enclosed the anonymous warning (115 *ant.*) makes absolutely *no* reference to the crushing of their recent hopes: "I have just come back from an excursion, and find your letter waiting for me. I haven't much to *write* you on it—God be thanked!—but simply to tell you my joy that you're coming *so soon*." There had been two chief motives for his desire of amnesty, to hear his latest opera, to see his friend: the first had been fulfilled, in part, the second was on the point of being. What more could he desire? And so, while waiting for his friend's arrival, the exile can write with cheerful irony to Fischer

(July 1): "I'm glad the royal Saxon police render it impossible for me to witness the performances of my operas, which could but make me angry."

What was it the exile meant by these repeated complaints of living in a "wilderness"? Frau Wille, recording her reminiscences after the lapse of many years, expresses quite the contrary opinion: "I cannot agree with what I have read and heard from here or there, that in Zurich Wagner knew the heavy sorrows of an exile.—The banished, whom all held high and many reverenced, lived in the security of his own hearth and home, and had friends to stand by him *One* among them [Otto Wesendonk] will seldom find his equal. Everybody felt honoured by a kind word from Wagner. The musicians, whether good or bad, all looked up to the author who with 'Opera and Drama' had opened new broad paths for music. Though he had ventured on the wild waters of the revolutionary movement, its billows had cast him on no inhospitable shore. The lot of political exiles, their long and bitter agony, their hopeless quest of sympathy, their knocking at barred doors, *he* never knew in Zurich."

That only shews how little the creaturely-kindest of hostesses may divine the inner trouble of a guest, for at the very time of Wagner's most frequent visits to Mariafeld his letters are full of the said laments. Take for instance the following to Roeckel, of Sept. '52: "My personal circumstances are shaping fairly comfortably, and I ought to be happy that I now can satisfy my immediate life-needs without too pressing an anxiety: but alas! I'm *very lonely;* I lack congenial company, and more than ever do I feel that the exceptional nature of my position has become a veritable curse on any enjoyment of life. A captive would be unable to comprehend why I mostly am so depressed and desirous of death; yet it is clear as day to myself.—Enough of that! You'll laugh me down; and to *you* indeed I can't deny the right." And three weeks later, to Liszt: "My desolation here is gradually becoming unbearable." The very fact that his local friends did *not* detect this heartache, is the strongest proof that his was indeed a "hopeless quest of sympathy," so far as concerns Mariafeld at least; the mere confounding him with the common "political exile"—quite in the manner of the Saxon authorities—sufficiently attests the justice of his cry.

He had a roof over his head, says Frau Wille, and appeared to be living in comfort; but neither she nor her husband had contributed to that first essential, whereas the intellectual entertainment on his visits to their house was provided mostly by himself or his companion Herwegh. It may seem ungracious to dissect the relations between host and guest; but when the former adopts so distinctly sermonising an air, a corrective is needed. Of course Frau Wille never heard from Wagner's mouth one murmur about his lack of congenial company: that sort of confidence is always reserved for the ears of bosom friends, and so long as she could class him in the same category with the professorial lions who bask in her recollections of the middle 'fifties, she was hopelessly shut out from insight into his spiritual needs. Truth to tell, the Mariafeld couple did not realise until long thereafter that they had been brought into contact with that "exceptional" visitant, a genius; and when the good lady searched her memory anterior to the revelation of 1864—in the shape of a King's messenger—she found it so threadbare that every approach to a record had to be eked out with banalities, whilst her year-dates seem strewn at sweet discretion, and are almost invariably wrong. Most difficult material to fit into a connected story.

With a sigh of relief we stumble on something like a correct date for once: "In 1853 Wagner lived in the Zeltweg, where Frau Minna, who was fond of company, played the amiable hostess in an agreeable home. Liszt had come to Zurich on a visit to his friend." Frau Wille's contribution to the history of that visit I shall defer awhile. Skipping her next few pages, which chiefly deal with her own superior "company," we are brought back to the following: "At the commencement of summer, Wagner, who lived without music at Zurich, so to say (though there was plenty to be had there), had occasion to conduct a selection from his own compositions at the theatre. An enthusiastic friend, a German merchant of Rhenish descent, had been joined by others in giving Wagner a free hand to gather artists from outside for this performance [to check this version, see cap. III.]. How the musicians, alike professional and amateur, took pains to put forth their best strength! Wagner indeed knew how to inspire the bandsmen by his guidance. An old gentleman, who had his own quartet evenings, and manœuvred his cello with conscientious pedantry, even said to me, 'Eh! when *that one* is by, one be-

comes a new man and musician!' After that concert great enthusiasm prevailed in Zurich, and ever higher rose the veneration for Richard Wagner's creative power." We have already heard from Wagner's own lips about the "philistines almost carrying him on their hands"; but it is singular that Frau Wille herself has not a word to say of the contents of that concert. If such were the usual reception accorded to his products at Mariafeld, it must have been chilling enough to their author. And indifference to all her guest's creative efforts since *Rienzi* is to be read in every similar allusion of this gentle chronicler's: the manner of execution is touched on, the substance studiously avoided.

Thus we have the little tale of Wagner at the pianoforte, when he would seem to have been preparing his hostess and friends for the festival concert, though she assigns it to the previous autumn. We will not quarrel over so immaterial a date, but take the story as a simple illustration: "Wagner came up from the gentlemen's quarters, sat down at the grand, and played us bits of Lohengrin and Tannhäuser—all from memory [marvellous!]. At the same time he described the happenings on the stage, explained the plot, and softly sang the text. It was remarkable, the way in which he thus made visible to us what our eyes were not seeing, and audible what was not sounding with the voices of a mighty orchestra, such as lay in his idea and plan. Of the work he had in hand he did not speak, but rather of the pleasure of taking a holiday." Again we find the same avoidance of personal appreciation of the works performed as noticed regarding the poem of the RING (74 *ant.*), and the guest must surely have remarked it also. Some lack of sympathy at anyrate he scented on another occasion, even on Frau Wille's own evidence. It was Beethoven that he was playing this time, and all went smoothly till—but no, the hostess of Mariafeld shall narrate the anecdote her own flowery way:—

"One day, while natural science and etymology were under discussion in the gentlemen's room, Wagner came to us ladies, saying, 'The two others [Wille and Herwegh] are hard at work root-digging again, and won't be done with it awhile.' He laughed, and opened the piano. Never shall I forget how he explained to us the character of the Ninth Symphony ere beginning to play, and demonstrated the necessity of the chorus

and Hymn to Joy in completion of this great tone-creation. He had been playing with full chords, when suddenly he paused, and said to me: 'Now listen, for the Muses enter; with warlike strains they lead a troop of striplings on: Froh, wie seine Sonnen fliegen [and so on].' This he said half to himself, then touched the keys.—Often have I heard the Ninth Symphony since, and with full orchestra, but *that* Allegro vivace alla marcia I have heard but once. No orchestra, no conductor has ever made me feel the Muses' light firm tread as Wagner when he touched my grand; pianissimo, as if moving on clouds, but drawing ever nearer with a measured step. What a revelation of the rhythmic sense controlling all the wonder-realm of tone! A beat of the pulse, more or less, can deaden or arouse the hearer's spirit. — Wagner looked serious, grave, yet benign. An elderly Zurich lady, a dear neighbour of ours, at other times so self-possessed, was as if electrified when he plunged into the chorus 'Seid umschlungen, Millionen,' with the full force of a gust of inspiration. In the middle of it he broke off: 'I can't play the piano at all,' he said, 'You don't applaud. So finish it yourselves!'"—We should much like to hear the other side of that account: Richard Wagner was scarcely the man to ask for "applause," except ironically, in the middle of a piece; were the good ladies really "electrified," or did they simply fidget?

Nevertheless, Wagner gives the Wille household yet another taste of Beethoven's masterpiece: "A few evenings later we heard some more of the Ninth Symphony . . . Herwegh [who had been reading a couple of his own poems aloud] had lapsed into silence like the rest of us, as if not personally concerned with what he had just recited. Then Wagner sat down to the pianoforte, and played the 'Freude trinken alle Wesen—.' That exultation of the high notes of the soprano in the quartet appeared to me a pure heavenly shout of joy from the liberated soul. I felt it must delight Herwegh, that we [?] had understood his noblest thoughts.—That evening we remained sitting long after supper. Wagner had not yet acquired the need of an obligato pint of champagne to brace his nerves, and on this occasion Wille did not declare that 'the select label on a bottle of Bordeaux interested Herwegh more than its contents.' The gentlemen did not despise the rare brands that ascended from the depths of the cellar in honour of the poet."

There is something so peculiarly philistine in Frau Wille's blend of gush and bathos, that we may imagine how it grated on poor Wagner's nerves at times. At Mariafeld, in any case, there was no danger of complications from platonic sympathy.

In the Wesendonk household, on the contrary, Wagner was regarded with a certain awe at present, rather as a transcendental kind of teacher, if we may judge by the recollections of Frau Mathilde: "At the time of his Dresden Court-Kapellmeistership I was at an educational institute in France, trying to explain to my French schoolfellows the true meaning of a 'Confédération germanique' —naturally in vain. Thus I came to Zurich quite untaught. Wagner himself called me a sheet of white paper, and undertook to write thereon.* . . . We made his personal acquaintance in 1852 . . . but it was not till 1853 that our friendship became more intimate [after Uhlig's death Wagner would feel at a loss without a pupil]. Then he began to initiate me more thoroughly into his intentions. First he read the 'Three Opera-poems,' which enraptured me; then the introduction to them [*Communication*], and by degrees, one of his prose-works after another. As I was fond of Beethoven, he played me the sonatas"—since the 'last' would have been quite beyond his pianistic skill, we may take this as referring to those of the 'second period,' evidence whereof is afforded by the so-called Album-Sonata written for the narratrix in this selfsame summer of 1853 under a motto from the Norns' scene.†

"Was a concert in sight, at which he had to conduct a Beethoven symphony," this grateful soul proceeds, "he never tired of playing me the various movements, both before and after rehearsal, until I felt quite at home in them. It delighted him, when I was able to follow him and my enthusiasm kindled at his own. On my appearing at a rehearsal in the morning, he exclaimed 'The very stones must marvel! Frau Wesendonk astir by 10 o'clock!'" If that were just before the three May-concerts, the following would seem to date just after: "Once on

* Cf. vol. iii, 275 and 293. It should be explained that Frau Wesendonk's reminiscences make no pretence to a continuous narrative. They were contributed to the *Allg. Mus. Ztg* of Feb. 14, 1896—quite a brief article—in refutation of a well-known author's hasty estimate of "the shade of Mæcenasdom" in this friendship, for which he has since made honourable amends.

† See Appendix. 479

a joint excursion to Brunnen* he played selections from the *Eroica* and C-minor symphonies on the old rattletrap in the coffee-room as twilight fell; next morning I was welcomed to breakfast with strains from 'Lohengrin.'"

It really is of some importance to note Wagner's constant preoccupation with Beethoven at a time when he was himself about to recommence the art of tone. But it was not in music alone that he instructed his charming pupil: "He inducted me into Schopenhauer's philosophy [a year or so later], and made a point of drawing my attention to every notable appearance in literature or science. Either he read aloud himself, or discussed the subject with me. Thus I owe to him alone the best of what I know."—Kindly, thankful recollections. But Frau Wesendonk herself admits that "he brought *Anregung* [impulsion] wherever he did not find it"; and though, half-echoing her friend Eliza Wille, she aptly asks, "If our beloved friend and master passed the years of his exile in a spiritual void, must he not have been a very bungling *teacher?*" still the earlier stages of that course of tuition can have brought but small *Anregung* to himself.

With Herwegh it was different. Yet on the one hand, his wife had rejoined him, and "St George," once more a family man, would now be less his own master; on the other, he had become too much absorbed in the natural sciences to have a free mind for questions of art. Best of friends and frequent companions he and Wagner remained; but the professorial atmosphere, into which the former naturally would drift, was never to the latter's liking.

Jakob Sulzer, too, was still a mainstay in more respects than one; but he appears to have either married, or commenced his courtship, about this date. In any case his friendship with Wagner, undiminished in moral worth on either side, was not quite on the

* May 30, 1853, Wagner writes Liszt: "Perhaps I shall transfer myself for a few weeks to Brunnen on the lake of Lucerne, try to collect my thoughts for work, make excursions thence to the Bernese Oberland, and so fill up the time till your longed-for arrival." This plan fell through, but the naming of Brunnen looks as if it were a discovery already made, and on the strength of an unquoted letter to Sulzer dated May 24, Steiner speaks of Wagner's having gone to the lake of Lucerne immediately after the festival-concerts—evidently the couple of days' trip with the Wesendonks referred to above, as they were away from urich the two ensuing months at least.

old familiar footing as regards mutual exchange of thought. "I was determined to have a good chat with you for once by letter," writes Wagner from London 1855, "as something seems to go wrong with our chats by word of mouth; some hook on which we have often been both left hanging, and now and then torn ourselves painfully. On the main point, I know, we are at one already; but it naturally was not so easy for me to coincide with you, as my artistic nature constrained me for long to a hope, a hope for the whole world as well as myself . . . about which we could not quite agree." If this somewhat vaguely points to intellectual friction, a later letter, from Venice Dec. '58, is rather more explicit: "With no one in my life, as with yourself, have I experienced what it means to come into relation with an august character: only with pride can I recall the pains you once took to set yourself in harmony with me. The conditions and needs of a nature so altogether made for Art, as mine, were bound to hold me fast at last to paths whereon so eminently practical a character as yours, for all its theoretic breadth of intellect, could only follow me from a distance . . . Yet I know that, even to keep wholly true to myself, I must always make for the point where our eyes, in spite of every variance, can meet with perfect understanding."

It was the *artist* in Wagner, then, the artist in the fullest sense, that stood "alone" in Zurich. Baumgartner, Alex. Müller and the rest, were beings of a lesser order—very good, or very worthy company, as the case might be, but with none of that ideal flight the artist needed in a comrade, that flight to keep pace with the stroke of his own strong wings. All Zurich's talents condensed into one could not have given him what Liszt, or his ideal of Liszt, alone could bring. For, however one's eyes may be opening to the fallacy in the wonted parallel Goethe-Schiller = Wagner-Liszt, some rarest breath of genius can never be denied the man who once held Europe spellbound by the magic of his touch.

For the last three years had our hero been clamouring for the friend of his heart. The very first letter suggesting a safe-conduct for Weimar (July '50) had supplemented that bootless petition as follows: "Would you not like to pay me a flying visit at Zurich yourself? If I could only see you again for once, I should go half-crazy with joy—that is to say, *quite* crazy, as people have certainly

thought me half crazy for ever so long.—I would also sing you Lohengrin—from A to Z: just think of that treat!"

And so it had gone on, crescendo and accelerando, till it reached a climax last November: "You *must* do one thing—arrange for us to see each other next summer. Reflect that this is a *necessity*—that it absolutely *must* be, and not even a god durst hinder you from coming to me, since the police prevent my coming to you!" Then Liszt makes a definite promise, greeted by Wagner with "This summer will recompense me for every lack by the unspeakable joy of seeing you at last. Believe me—*that* makes up for all" (Jan. 13, '53). Liszt in February: "Above all, you must get yourself well again, dearest friend. We shall want to be strolling together soon, and you will need to be sound on your legs. For my part I have no intention to sip *tisane* with you in Zurich; so you must see to it that I do not find you an invalid"; and Wagner, March 4: "I'm already gloating over your Zurich visit every day, and seriously preparing to be able to set the 'tisane' aside by then." In April the exile writes, 11th, "I'm living on nothing but the anticipation of your visit," and 13th, "That I have to stand so far from *my* battlefield, makes me grumble so often at present! Still—my fairest hope will soon be fulfilled: I shall see *you* again! On your arrival—and because of that itself—you'll be certain to find me in such high spirits that you'll vote all my past and present groans pure humbug. My nerves, to be sure, are sorely ailing, and that has its very natural cause; yet I've been given a hope of thoroughly setting them up again: it will require a little 'life,' however, as the doctors can't do everything. That 'life' *you're* going to bring me: so I promise, you shall find me hale and hearty!—I'm almost glad you are *not* coming to my concert: we shall be the more by ourselves and to ourselves. Eh, **how the thought of it cheers me!!**"

Now he resembles a schoolboy looking forward to the holidays, now a lover awaiting his mistress, so ardent is the exile's longing. Early in May: "You've no prospect of leave yet? (!!) Don't keep me on tenterhooks, but tell me by return of post you're *coming* and coming *quickly* . . . I shall expect you for certain in the first days of June. If only I don't go crazy with the joy of seeing you again!" The end of May, just a week after the threefold concert: "It's downright hard, that you should leave me still alone for the whole month of June! Have your court-celebrations been suddenly

postponed? Not till the *middle of July*!!—Ah, you would have done me an infinitude of good precisely now: I'm growing very—lonely now!... My brain is dizzy: I yearn for a long, long sleep, and to awake but to clasp *you* in my arms." June 14: "You're sure not to come *this* month? So, without danger of missing you, I can go next week to Interlaken and the Oberland, where I want to see a portion of the Ritter family. At the beginning of July I shall be back, and expecting you daily. That Franz and Joachim will come as well, is famous: Franz had already half promised me. It will be a great pleasure to me, to make their acquaintance... It worries me much, that—like myself—you seem not quite the thing; but I'm becoming more and more convinced that people like us must always be unwell except in the moments, hours and days of productive excitement: then, though, we enjoy and revel more than any other men. 'Tis so. But soon by word of mouth!! I'm almost getting afraid of the joy!!!"

So Liszt fixes the day—"My time is cut very fine, but it will be an unspeakable delight to me, to pass a few days with you"—in a letter that awaits Wagner on his return from his trip to the Kummers (that "portion of the Ritter family"), June 28 or 29, and he promptly answers with "Joy that you are coming so *soon*. Saturday the 2nd of July, then, morning or evening, I shall await you at the Post. You could stay in my house, only I fear it might irk you, especially if you're coming with Joachim and Franz. But we'll discuss all that at the Post. There's a good hotel close by there: Hotel de Baur. I'm sending word to Kirchner and Eschmann.* My God, **how delighted I am!!**—So not a word more by letter. Auf—**Wiedersehen!!**"

---

* Theodor Kirchner (born 1824), then organist at Winterthur, where resided also J. C. Eschmann (born 1825). Liszt's letter of June 23 had expressed the desire to make their personal acquaintance, probably having heard of them through Hans von Bülow, who presently brackets their names in an article on "The Opposition in South Germany" contributed to the *Neue Zft* of Dec. 2, '53: "The little townlet Winterthur in Switzerland, where the talented Theodor Kirchner and the gifted Carl Eschmann display an artistic activity attended by the amplest success, can boast of such a sterling and intimate musical life as Munich will never attain if it abides by its present direction. Winterthur is several decads ahead of Munich, and a musical Aranjuez compared with that dead Madrid." Winterthur bandsmen had helped in Wagner's recent festival, also in the rendering of the *Tannhäuser* overture last year.—About Eschmann there is not much more to say; in *Grove's Dict.* he is dis-

Liszt's journey itself has points of interest for us. To Wagner he had announced it as follows: "I leave Weimar on the 28th of June, and must stop at Carlsruhe till the 1st of July, to inspect the locale and arrange a few preliminaries for the projected music-festival." Here Liszt's letters to Princess Carolyne Sayn-Wittgenstein take up the tale. June 29: "Arriving at Frankfort at 11, I was met at the station by Schmidt, with whom I passed a few hours consulting on the musical situation . . . We have agreed that I shall return to Frankfort the 11th of July, when Schmidt will give *Tannhäuser* for me, with Johanna Wagner . . . Soon after 4 o'clock I departed for Carlsruhe . . . I have spent to-day in conversations, explanations and so on, about the Music-festival, and supped with Devrient, the Zigesar of the place. The theatre has a very good style, even an air of grandeur. It is to be presumed that our festival, for which I have decided on the theatre, will have a perfect success. Nevertheless that prospect, however agreeable in itself, is clouded for me by the thought that my absence may grieve you. I promise to be more chary of consenting to similar propositions next year, since it is not good that we should be separated, under whatever pretext. To-morrow I am to be received by the Prince Regent and the Grand Duchess [of Baden] . . . Carlsruhe is a city all drawn out by compass, where it is difficult to distinguish the four main streets, or rather avenues of houses, from one another. The pavements and gas-lighting give it a sort of resemblance to some quarter in London. At first sight the effect is fine enough, but in the long run I believe you would prefer our cobbles and blinking lamps of Weymar." June 30, "Mme la Grande-duchesse is of a perfectly graceful amiability. I chatted about Weymar and Gotha with her, and am pleased to imagine she will have retained a rather good impression of the three quarters of an hour I passed in her society . . . There is some

---

missed with a couple of lines, as having "made himself a name by his excellent selections of classical works for beginners" etc., and the statement that "he died at Zurich, Oct. 25, 1882." Kirchner became far better known, though chiefly as "a composer of 'genre pieces' for the pianoforte" in the style of Schumann, to whom, and subsequently to Brahms (from 1865), he was devoted. We shall meet him again in 1856. After many vicissitudes he died at Hamburg, Sept. 19, 1903—see an appreciative necrologue in *Die Musik* III. 2.

local opposition to the *Musikfest*, but it will take place notwithstanding, either this year or next. From 5 to 6 o'clock there was a conference at the theatre, and at 6 the Prince Regent received me. With him I spoke of nothing but the organisation of the festival . . . This morning I received two letters, one from Joachim, who is obliged to remain at Göttingen, the other from Wagner, who expects me the day after tomorrow. I am touched by the pleasure my visit appears to give him. If you could only have come with me." No: *this* time, for the first meeting in four long years, Wagner would decidedly prefer to have Liszt all to himself, not merely a quarter of him; and perhaps it was a relief that Joachim also could not accompany him on this occasion, whereas Robert Franz had just declined.*

Thanks to the circumstantiality of Liszt's reports to his Egeria, we are now in possession of a very full account of his memorable Zurich visit. July 3 he writes: "On Friday the 1st, after lunching with Leiningen [Marshal of the Baden Court], I left Carlsruhe about 1 for Basle, and thence by coach at 10 p.m. for Zurich. The journey takes nine hours . . . Wagner was waiting for me at the Post-house, and we nearly choked each other with embraces. At times he has as it were an eaglet's cry in his voice. He wept and laughed and stormed with joy at seeing me again—for at least a quarter of an hour. We went to his rooms at once, and never left each other all the day. He is very well housed [etc., 100 *ant.*]. He is looking well, though rather thinned in these 4 years. His features, in particular his nose and mouth, have acquired a remarkable finesse and accentuation. His dress is, if anything, dandified (*Sa mise est plutôt élégante*). He wears a hat of slightly pinkish white,† has by no means the democratic tone, and has

* See Liszt to Wagner, June 29, '53; also Franz to Liszt Jan. '54 (*B.h. Ztgn*), where we have hints of complications recently arisen from a long series of unsigned articles in the *Neue Zeitschrift*, entitled "Zur Würdigung Wagner's," by Franz's brother-in-law, Hinrichs. These articles, nine in number, began in the issue for May 13, '53, and ended in that for Nov. 11; towards their conclusion, Bülow and Raff are attacked as "notorious hangers-on of Wagner"; to which Bülow replies on the 18th Nov. (in a very clever skit entitled "Ein Schwager"—"A brother-in-law"), and Raff on the 25th.

† Presumably the same concerning which Liszt writes Wagner July 12: "I came near to difficulties with the police over your hat at Carlsruhe—this shape and tint is specially suspected, and they call it red, albeit grey—I was accidentally warned about it. Nevertheless I got safe away with it as far as here

assured me a score of times that, since his residence here, he has completely broken with the refugee party—and even got into the good graces of the civic big guns and aristocracy of the canton [see iii, 272]. His relations with musicians are those of a great general who should have nothing but a dozen candlestick-makers to discipline [meaning?]. His logic regarding artists is pitiless in its trenchancy. As for myself, he loves me heart and soul, and never ceases saying, 'See what you've made of me!' when we talk of matters relating to his fame and popularity. Twenty times in the day he fell on my neck—then rolled on the ground, caressing his dog Peps and talking nonsense to it, turn by turn—reviling the *Jews*, a generic term with him, of most elastic meaning. In one word, a grand and grandissimo nature—something like Vesuvius in one of its pyrotechnic displays, pouring out sheaves of flame and bouquets of roses and lilac. 'Art is but Elegy,' he told me among other things—and as he developed this theme of the artist's infinite sufferings of every hour, it led me to say, 'Yes, and the crucified God is Truth.'"

The picture is a little bizarre, but Carolyne demanded striking lights and shades, not toning down, and it is impossible to doubt the general truth of this first impression. Wagner confirms it himself, in a measure, by his summing up to Wesendonk of July 13: "A wildly excited, but vastly beautiful week have I just passed through: Liszt left me but a few days since. A very storm of confidences raged between us: my joy at the unspeakably lovable man was all the greater as I found him vigorous, a good stayer, and much better in health than I could have expected from earlier. We had incredibly much to tell each other: for at bottom it was here we first made one another's closer personal acquaintance, as I had never spent more than a few flying days with him before. So the eight days, which were all he was able to bestow on me this time, were filled with so much matter that I'm wellnigh stunned by it now."

As to the matter of those first "confidences," we may divine a little of it. Naturally there would be a discussion of the future Carlsruhe festival, at which Liszt was once more to raise the

---

[Frankfort], and shall always maintain that the hat must be *sound-principled* since it was you who gave it me. Apropos of your *unpolitical* attitude" etc. (see 116 *ant.*).

Wagnerian banner; but to that I shall return in due course. Wagner's own personal affairs, and those of his friend—the troubles about removing the obstacles to the latter's marriage to his princess; the rumours that Liszt was breaking with Weimar (see Wagner's letters of Apr. 11 and May 30, with others from Berlioz, &c.) owing to non-compliance with his artistic demands at the theatre. That there had been some foundation for those rumours, we gather from Liszt's letter of next Oct. 31: "With the Flying Dutchman I temporarily parted from the orchestra at the beginning of March: with the selfsame work I resume my theatric connections this season. You may well imagine that it is solely my passion for your tone- and word-poems, that induces me not to renounce my Kapellmeister functions. Small as may be the result I can attain here, I believe it is not quite illusory. We brought a Wagner-week to pass,* and the Fliegender Holländer, Tannhäuser and Lohengrin, have taken firm root here—for the rest I do not care a rap, with the single exception of Berlioz' Cellini."

To resume Liszt's letter of July 3 where I broke it short, or rather, where it suddenly broke itself on prose once more:—"Wagner's wife is no longer pretty, and has grown somewhat stout—but she has good manners, and attends to her own housekeeping—even her cooking. For to-day he wanted to kill the fatted calf and make a great feast. We had difficulty in moderating him on this point, and reducing the invitations to dinner to the number of 10 or 12. Hermann [L.'s conjuring valet] will wait table, as he has no man-servant." The names of these "10 to 12" Liszt does not furnish, but we can make a fairly accurate guess at them. There would be his house-neighbours the Heims, the Kummer pair and Emilie Ritter, Alex. Müller and daughter, Sulzer, Baumgartner, Kirchner and Eschmann, perhaps Spyri and Herwegh, and certainly François Wille.

All of these were personal strangers to Liszt, with exception of Herwegh and Wille. As to the latter's acquaintanceship we may draw once more upon the tangled memoirs of his wife: "Soon after the great fire that laid half Hamburg in ashes [1843] Liszt had come there and played for the benefit of the orchestra-fund,

---

* Weimar première of the *Holländer* Feb. 16, '53, followed by a cycle of the three operas on the 27th and March 2 and 5; see also vol. iii, 406.

and with his wellnigh royal munificence made over to that institute a sum which helped it to prosperity. Wille and he were brought into daily contact then. My husband has often told me that at a time when, in spite of his indigence, he had resigned his position as editor (since the proprietor of the journal wanted to browbeat him and clip his articles), Liszt had sought him out and said to him, 'If I had a country-seat, and invited you to be my guest—would you consider that an affront to your pride?—It is precisely the same if I invite you to accompany me on my travels. What do you want with Hamburg? Paris is the place for you'—but, no matter what his circumstances, Wille went his own way." The incident is not improbable, since Liszt was always asking somebody to share his travelling purse in those days. But we must return to the present occasion, when Frau Wille informs us how the two acquaintances met once more, in the house on the Zeltweg, and "My husband told me that he asked Liszt if his influence at Weimar could not succeed in procuring Wagner's return to Germany [a palpable anachronism], to which Liszt replied that he knew of no appointment and no stage that would be of use to Wagner: he needed a theatre, singers, orchestra, everything in brief, after his own mind. Wille interposed, 'But that would cost over a million francs!' Whereupon Liszt exclaimed in French—his custom when particularly excited—'*Il l'aura! Le million se trouvera!*'" However twisted and confused in its beginning, the end of this story, with its incredulous François Wille and prophetic Franz Liszt, is indisputably authentic: all it needs is a little reframing, to stand as a minute of the conversation round the board at that dinner in the Zeltweg on Sunday the 3rd of July. The said reframing will be furnished by the close of Liszt's next epistle to Carolyne; a very long epistle, but teeming with characteristics—not of Wagner alone.

Monday, July 4: "I did better than go to see *Lohengrin* at Wiesbaden—Wagner and I set to work yesterday and sang the whole duo of Elsa and Lohengrin.* 'Ma foi, c'était superbe'—to quote our poor friend Chopin—and we understand each other like twin brothers. In the evening we went to see Herwegh, who is living with his wife in a house on the shore of the lake,

* Cf. Wagner's letter to Wesendonk: "In the first couple of days I sacrificed my voice, so that Liszt had to do all the music thereafter; he played quite incredibly."

and has entrenched himself behind a stack of scientific books and chemical and optical instruments etc., etc., like the late Dr Faust —yet simply enough and without ostentation. I find him changed to his advantage, his head almost bald—the lower part of the face framed by a strong beard—and rather robust in body. For some years past he has been pursuing a course of studies in natural history,* and latterly has also been much occupied with Sanscrit and Hebrew. He is projecting a long epic, something after the fashion of the Divine Comedy. *Excusez du peu;* what say you?—Round about Zurich the lake has much resemblance to that of Como, minus the richness and variety of vegetation. I should think one might live happy there—beyond a doubt, were *you* there. I have always had a great predilection for lakes; they are more in harmony with my habitual note of reverie, than great rivers or the ocean . . ." Informing as is this contribution to Liszt's own psychology, we will pass a few sentences farther:—

"Wagner has declared open house from morning till night, during my stay here. I have a little scruple about the expense I am occasioning him, since there are always a dozen of us at table for dinner at 1 and supper at 9.30." Seeing that Liszt is writing but 48 hours after his arrival, and that the first day had manifestly been passed without company, the exaggeration of two meals into "toujours" should not escape notice, however unimportant in itself. Yet the underlying thought is kindly, for Liszt proceeds: "I have begged him to come and dine with me at my Hôtel du Lac to-day—and tomorrow, or the day after, I fancy we shall make an excursion of 24 to 48 hours among the mountains, with Herwegh only. This evening he intends to commence the reading of his *Nibelungen*," and so on (78 *ant.*) with the remark about Wagner's recent festival concerts having won him the suffrages even of the "philistines who had been most prejudiced against him." But this is continued by a piece of gossip which rather jars: "One of our mutual friends told me yesterday

* See Wagner to Roeckel, Jan. '54: "Nature is not so remote from me as you seem to think, though I am no longer in a position to place myself in scientific relations with her. For that I must rely on Herwegh, who also lives here, and has long been engaged in a most thorough study of Nature. Through this friend I learn quite beautiful and weighty things about her, with great effect on me in many a way."

in confidence, that in his first years of residence here, when he offended everybody by his ways (*alors qu'il maltraitait tout le monde par ses façons d'être*), Wagner only very gradually gained ground in the esteem and consideration of the natives; but that after the rehearsals and performances of those concerts he had become so amiable that no one could resist him any longer."—Instinctively one asks, *which* of "nos amis communs" could it have been? There were only two of them; and of those two, Herwegh is excluded by the very nature of the "confidence," as we have seen that his contempt for the "philistines" was far more sweeping than Wagner's own. François Wille alone remains, with his reputedly caustic tongue: * no one who took the smallest interest in musical affairs, could have been unaware that Wagner's local popularity dated from *long* before the triple concert—which indeed would otherwise have been an impossibility.

Liszt continues: "Moreover, there are great things in preparation for him, according to my interlocutor. This very week he is to be named honorary member of several musical societies—which can but be a prelude to his freedom of the city of Zurich—which will lead straight to the dignity of Conductor in chief, *General-Musikdirektor*, of the Confédération Helvétique [Liszt's informant had indeed strange notions, not only of Wagner's aspirations, but also of Swiss art-affairs]. It seems he has no sort of intercourse with the immigrants, either German or foreign—and he has sworn me on his *Nibelungen* that never in his life would he meddle with politics again. Several of his friends and protectors belong to the ultra-conservative party [105*n ant.*]. Only, he suspects that one of the spies employed to report to Dresden or Berlin is personally hostile to him—in grudge for his having once treated him de haut en bas. In passing, be it said, that is his usual custom, even with people who manifest some zeal in their obsequiousness to him. His manners are decidedly domineering, and he maintains toward everyone at least a scarcely veiled reserve. In my case, however, complete and

* July 11, Liszt to Carolyne: "I have noted on my tablets some anecdotes of Wille's about Heine, whom he saw not long ago . . . It is miserable wit! We will also run through several other little tales and sayings, of which I have also taken memoranda. They would lose too much without the commentaries, which I have not the patience to write unless you command me."

absolute exception is made. Yesterday he told me again, 'All Germany, for me, is you'—and he lets slip no opportunity of signifying the same to his friends and acquaintances. His ways and turn of mind (*ses allures et son mouvement d'esprit*) would please you much, I fancy. He has frankly taken his stand as an exceptional man, of whom the public is not in a position to estimate aught but the seamy side. He emphatically protests against the pretended system which idiots have seen fit to extract from his writings, and we joke consumedly over the interpretations and commentaries bestowed on the words *Sonderkunst* and *Gesammtkunst*. It was not himself, but Uhlig, who invented the word *Sonderkunst**—and Brendel gives him the impression of a brewer of mash for cats. As for Raff, he is antipathetic to him by nature—and presumes that his articles have rather done him bad service. Among his disciples and fanatics he distinguishes [Karl] Ritter—allowance made for the absurd—with a particular predilection. The Ritters make him a regular subvention of more than 1000 écus a year [say £150]—and the style in which he lives seems to me to require at least double, if not treble that. His cellar is very well filled, according to what Hermann tells me—and he has a pronounced taste for luxury and elegance."—No doubt Wagner had begun to be rather lavish in his outlay of late, on the strength of receipts from *Tannhäuser*, but open house he did not keep except in honour of so rare a guest, nor did he travel about with a valet.

That ends Liszt's general characterisation, in which we ought to distinguish between personal observation, hearsay, and—that amplification which had already turned twice into "toujours." But the epistle itself has by no means ended; its most important section still remains, the part required for our reframing of Frau Wille's reminiscence [140 *ant.*]. Connecting it with the sentence last quoted, to which it forms a sequel in Liszt's letter, we obviously have an echo here of the table-talk of yesterday:—

* Whether it was really Uhlig's invention or not, the word is used by Brendel as part of the standing heading of an editorial that runs through six instalments in the *Neue Zeitschrift*, Feb. 18 to March 25, '53: "Die bisherige Sonderkunst und das Kunstwerk der Zukunft." Wagner's own expression in *The Art-work of the Future* etc. is "Kunstart," i.e. "art-variety" or "branch of art." With the mere cacophony of the substituted term he would scarcely have quarrelled, had Brendel & Co. shewed better understanding of the cause at stake: see his letter of Aug. 16, '53, to Liszt.

"He is not abandoning his Zurich theatrical projects, and wishes to construct a new building—for which a certain number of subscribers would have to guarantee the funds. In any case he will give himself the pleasure of organising something quite *unheard of* as soon as he has finished the composition of his *Nibelungen*, and I willingly support him in this idea. If, as I believe, his importance continues to increase, and to become altogether predominant in Germany and Switzerland—there can be no doubt that one will succeed in finding the 100,000 fr. that are necessary to realise his idea of a *Bühnenfestspiel*. I imagine that in the summer of 1856 he will assemble here the company he will need to give his four dramas—and it will probably not be a bad speculation even from the pecuniary point of view—for he could easily attract several thousand visitors to this place for a fête of the kind. If Monseigneur [Gd Duke to be] takes my advice, he will offer Weimar or Eisenach for execution of this colossal scheme—though obstacles are to be feared from the parsimony of our cheeseparing customs."—The estimate still is far too low, not only in point of time, "1856," but also in point of money: Wille's "*million*" comes much nearer to the ultimate cost. The main thing, however, is Liszt's ardour for his friend's huge scheme; and that is ratified by Wagner's letter to Wesendonk of the 13th: "To my most reassuring surprise, Liszt thoroughly concurs with my own plan for the eventual performance of my Bühnenfestspiel. We have settled that it shall take place from spring to autumn of one year at Zurich; a provisional theatre shall be built for it, and what I want in the way of singers, etc., expressly engaged. Liszt will collect donations for the undertaking from every quarter of the compass, and is confident of being able to beat up the needful money. You see, we've settled no small thing between us!"

Tuesday the 5th we have no letter, but on Wednesday Liszt tells Carolyne: "To-day we are to begin our excursion, from which we shall not return till the day after tomorrow. Herwegh, with whom I sympathise—he has very good manners [an odd refrain]—will accompany us. Our goal is the Lake of Lucerne. Wagner takes his *Siegfried* with him. Yesterday and the day before, he read *Rheingold* and *Die Walküre* to us, with incredible energy and intelligence of accent—and this evening we are to have *le jeune Siegfried*" (who had by no means *bonnes manières*). The

remainder of the letter does not concern us, saving perhaps these few sentences: "My departure from here remains fixed for Saturday. I have spoken to Herwegh on the subject of a '*Christ*' such as I should like to compose—it is not impossible that he may undertake this work and do it well. Mme Herwegh seems quite a nice woman—and has given her husband rare proofs of devotion and abnegation during the past few years."

The joint expedition, a relief from "all the vigils of Zurich," is started on the 6th. Friday the 8th we have Liszt's account of it: "The day before yesterday, at 3 of the afternoon, in magnificent sunshine, Wagner, Herwegh and I embarked on the Zurich steamboat en route for Brunnen, one of the most beautiful spots on the Lake of Lucerne. It was I who proposed this excursion à trois, in the first place to escape the visitors who threaten to encumber us here—and to talk freely with Wagner, should occasion present itself. I had also a secret need of yielding myself to one of those great impressions which grand sites always make on me —and resigned myself to spending a hundred francs for that end. After 2 hours on the steamer and 4 or 5 in a carriage, passing by Richterswyl and Schweiz, we reached Brunnen about 11 at night. *You* were present everywhere, through those mysterious emanations of the heart that link us together. . . . Yesterday morning, Thursday, at 7 o'clock we took two boatmen to row us to Rütli—more correctly, Grütli—and Tell's chapel. At Grütli we halted at the three springs, and the idea occurred to me to propose *Brüderschaft* with Herwegh, taking water in the hollow of my hand at each of the three sources. Wagner did the same with him. Later, we went at some detail into our project of 'Christ,' and I believe he [H.] will soon realise it finely.* It is the work through which I shall speak to *you* of my faith and love . . . We stopped a few minutes at Tell's chapel. The boatman told us that in Ascension week they say 16 masses there in a day. When we see each other again, remind me of the alphabetic letters M and N, that I may tell you a scrap of conversation from that chapel of Tell. By ½ past ten we were back at Brunnen, whence we returned here

* July 15 Wagner writes Liszt: "Georg sends his greetings; he shall soon become poet again, for your sake," and a couple of weeks later: "St Georg is still lazy: but work he *shall*." Nevertheless, the text of Liszt's *Christus* oratorio was eventually put together by himself (or the princess?).

at 6 in the evening viâ the Lake of Zug." Not much chance of reading *Siegfried*, on those two days.

This letter of the 8th, Liszt's last from Zurich, concludes with a not unimportant piece of news: "I have this moment received a telegram from Talleyrand, announcing the death of the Grand Duke." The message had come as no shock, since Liszt had left instructions at Weimar to inform him of such an eventuality at once. By the death of Carl Friedrich, the young prince we have met so often under the title of Her[y] Grand Duke became a German ruler. For Liszt, Carl Alexander's accession gave promise of a smoother path at the Weimar court-theatre; for Wagner it opened a possibility of more effective intercession at some future date, though nothing of the sort was to be dreamt of at present, so soon after the renewed warrant of arrest. A letter of condolence and congratulation was evidently recommended by Liszt, as Wagner writes one within a few days of his friend's departure.*

Of the final day or two of Liszt's stay in Zurich we have no record. Possibly the remaining half of the Ring-poem was read aloud; but that I cannot say, though there would be an opportunity for it if Liszt did not leave till the 10th—which seems probable.

A few days after the parting, Wagner writes: "And what remains? Sadness! Sadness!—After we had watched the coach bear you away, not another word did I say to Georg: silently I wended home; silence reigned everywhere! Thus was your farewell kept—dear fellow: for us the light had faded out! O come back soon, and dwell a long time in our midst! If you knew what godlike traces you have left behind you! All have become nobler and gentler; greatness awakes in straitened minds—

* Liszt, July 17, Weimar: "Your letter to Carl Alexander reached me this morning. Admirable, and altogether worthy of you. This afternoon I go to Ettersburg, to pay my devoirs to the young liege, and shall hand him the letter at once." To Carolyne next day: "Monseigneur was taking a stroll. The chasseur having pointed out the avenue he had followed, I made bold to track him down. One of the first things he said, was 'Le Verbe doit se faire action maintenant.' I called his attention to the date of installation, Aug. 28 [Goethe's birthday—*Lohengrin* anniversary], and thereupon handed him Wagner's letter, which to me seems very good, and which struck him sufficiently." To Wagner, the 25th: "I handed the young Gd Duke your letter, and can assure you he was sensible to your noble language and elevated tone."

and melancholy covers all . . . My wife and I read your letter together in high delight: she greets you from her heart." For Liszt had sent a grateful message from Frankfort on the 12th: "My most cordial greetings to your wife, and very best thanks for all the kindness and affection she shewed me during my Zurich stay.—Neither must you forget my loyal homages to Frau Kummer and her sister. Tell our Grütly-brother [Herwegh] and his wife all my sincerely friendly feelings toward them, and give Baumgartner a thorough good *shake-hand* (translated into Swiss music) in my name. The Zeltweg days will remain days of bright sunshine for me.* God grant I may soon come to you again.—Your Doppel-Peps, or 'Double extract de Peps,' or 'Double Stout Peps' *con doppio movimento*" etc. etc.—It is quite another key from any struck by Liszt before, and its very homeliness proves how good it would have been for *both* these men to live more often in each other's company. Even the tale of the exchange of hats (137 *n. ant.*) shews an unbending not habitual with Liszt, accustomed to the starch of court-etiquette. Neither was the hat the only personal belonging of Wagner's that he carried off and treasured up: in '55 he writes to a friend, "I find that I dropped a yellow foulard in your room. I should not trouble about it, were a particular souvenir not attached thereto. It was Wagner who gave it me at Zurich two years back, one day when I wept hot tears while making music with him. So take care of that villainous-looking yellow handkerchief!"

For reasons soon to appear, we will accompany Liszt on his homeward journey. The 11th he writes his princess from Badenweiler in the Black Forest, "quite close to the Swiss frontier," and as he speaks of having "passed the night on the imperial of the diligence with Hermann," it is to be presumed that he had *not* left Zurich till the 10th. He had branched off to this little spa in order to meet E. Devrient, "whose daughter is seriously ill and his wife very ailing. We discussed our festival projects, which will probably be realised about the 20th of next September. Tomorrow morning I shall see Leiningen once more, on my way through Carlsruhe—and in the evening I shall be at Frankfort." When Liszt once sets his best foot foremost, he is as ubiquitous as

* From Carlsbad he writes Köhler, Aug. 1: "At the beginning of July I enjoyed some Walhall-days with Wagner, and thank God for having created such a man."

a commercial traveller: the whole of these four or five days of his journey home are devoted more or less to Wagner's cause. What he has to report from Frankfort, moreover, is peculiarly instructive, since we have rather lost sight of Wagner's niece of late, that Johanna whom her uncle himself brought out at Dresden in 1845 as the first exponent of his "Elisabeth":—

Frankfort, July 13, to P^ss^ Carolyne: "There was a little concert yesterday at the theatre. I heard la Wagner sing three of Schubert's *Lieder*. Rather a talent of convention, than a puissantly gifted nature. Certainly she has some bell-like notes in her throat—but on the whole gives me the impression of those German landscapes I love no more than you do—something like the Königstein, if you will permit the simile. As she had to leave again this morning, I went to see her in her *camerino* at the theatre, when she very amiably invited me to call at her own rooms after the concert, so as to talk more at ease. She excused herself as best she could, for not having sung *Tannhäuser* here [see 136 *ant.*] —a thing which seems to me a positive scandal, as I made no bones about telling her. I tried to be at once polite and candidly explicit with her—and she ended by proposing to come and sing Elisabeth and *Ortrud!* in course of the winter at Weimar—which I accepted, subject to Zigesar's approval.* This category of celebrated songstresses has fallen completely behind my aspirations of the last five years: the gewgaws of the stage, a few good notices and clappings of hands, suffice them. Wagner defines art as 'a feeble surrogate of life': the generality of *artistes* are unhappily nothing but a sorry 'surrogate' of art. For that matter, Frl. Wagner and I parted on fairly good terms, though I had told her pretty plainly what was *my* manner of understanding the works of her uncle, etc. etc."

From Frankfort Liszt makes a flying trip to Wiesbaden, where he had hoped to hear *Lohengrin* on the 14th, but is disappointed

* Liszt to Wagner next January: "Zigesar invited Johanna to sing Ortrud the middle of May, and offered her a decent fee—but her answer is fairly evasive, 'if I do not have to go to England then,' and so on." Johanna Wagner did not sing at Weimar until 1856, and then none of her uncle's music; but neither did she sing in England before that year, though she had crossed the Channel in 1852. For the reason of London's being deprived of her public appearance in the earlier year, see Appendix, where we shall also learn *why* she expected to be compelled to "go to England" in 1854.

again "through indisposition of the Ortrud." He invites Schindelmeisser and Herr and Frau Moritz * to supper, however, and that is the origin of the Lohengrin-snuffbox, which reaches Wagner just as the doctor orders him "to give snuff-taking up once for all; an embargo to be appreciated only by such a passionate snuff-taker as I have been. I discover now that snuff was my sole enjoyment 'off and on': and that I have now to cut off. My torments are indescribable; but I shall go through with it.† So —no more *boxes:* I accept nothing but *orders* henceforward!"

Physically "much fatigued by this scrap of a journey," Liszt returns to Weimar on the 16th, whence he writes Wagner next day a similar account of the latter's niece to that just cited: "Johanna will sing in Tannhäuser at R. about a fortnight hence. She was obliged to leave Frankfort immediately after the concert on the 12th, owing to her starring engagements. I spoke to her first in her dressing-room at the theatre, and she invited me to visit her for a quarter of an hour after the concert. That quarter of an hour I employed in fulfilling my duties as doctor and apothecary of the true faith. I told her many a this and that, which she could hardly fail to understand.—Before I took my leave, she promised to sing *Ortrud* and Elisabeth at Weimar next winter, which I very gratefully accepted. Papa [Albert Wagner] has London projects for a German opera-company. He considered that your operas would be sure to make a hit there. I replied that the indispensable must first have been done for them

* L. to W., July 17: "Frau Moritz is quite an adorable woman and artist. She is studying Elsa and Senta, and is thoroughly determined to make active propaganda with your operas." She had already done so with *Tannhäuser* in 1852-3, and in the Spring of '54 we hear from Augsburg, "Herr Wagner's *Tannhäuser* has been represented six times, with Mad. Moritz as Elisabeth" (*M. W.* May 20), while Johanna is starring in Rossini's *Tancredi*, Meyerbeer's *Prophète* and Bellini's *Romeo* (*Mont. e. Cap.*) to such a tune that a Bremen correspondent writes the *Musical World* of May 27, "Fräulein Johanna Wagner and Herr Tichatscheck have been creating a *furore*. On account of the high terms required by these two celebrated artists, the management was obliged to raise the prices, at which the good people at Bremen were greatly displeased." But Tichatschek, whose tour is quite distinct from Johanna's, sings in *Tannhäuser* from time to time; whereas, so far as I can gather, the composer's niece leaves it severely alone for another year.

† Cf. Aug. 17 to Fischer: "Imagine it! I have had to give up snuff; for 6 days already I haven't taken a pinch! The immediate effect is as if I were going crazy."

in Germany.—There is time enough for London, where they could completely succeed only after their footing had been secured in Germany." Had Liszt only known what Albert Wagner does not appear to have told him, he would have seen that Albert's "London projects" were all moonshine, since his daughter had been restrained by a perpetual injunction in Chancery from appearing at any other London theatre than the one with which he and she had broken faith last year (see App.); whereas she had not stirred a hand to get her uncle's operas produced when both the London operatic impresarios were kneeling at her feet. How keenly Richard felt the ingratitude of this niece of his, is apparent in his anwer (July 26): "I'm almost vexed that you have consorted with X [his brother and niece]: these people are not worth the courting. Mark my words, no good will come of it: *whole* folk or *none at all*—only no halves; they drag us down —we can never draw them up. For myself, it would simply make me prouder, if this talent entirely deprived me of her support."

From that sidelight we must get back to Wagner's own doings.

"Here I sit in the chief town of Graubünden," he writes Liszt July 15; "everything is grey! grey (*grau*). I must take pink paper—to counteract it; just as a certain flush of red suffused the grey of your hat.—You see, I take refuge in bad puns, and may infer my mood from that. Desolation—grey, horrid desolation, since you went away! Wednesday evening my Zurichers tried to dispel it with their torches [117 *ant.*] . . . Next morning I left with Georg: it has poured in torrents ever since; last evening we found the only postchaise from Chur [Coire] to St Moritz already fully booked, and had to reconcile ourselves to passing two nights and a day here. Before leaving Zurich, I found your Frankfort letter at the post [and read it there with Minna]: one last delight I therefore bore away with me from the deserted city; be heartily thanked for it, dear vanished happiness!!!"

The present destination had been fixed, by medical orders, some time before Liszt's visit. May 30: "I'm to go to St Moritz in Graubünden the second half of July, to undergo a cure, from which a great improvement of my health is promised me. Couldn't you come with me to that wild and lovely solitude? That would be splendid! . . . I believe it would do *you* good, as well: we should be 5000 feet high there, and enjoy the most nerve-bracing

air and a mineral water said to be excellent for the digestive organs." The old familiar cry about the nerves and stomach, which none of his medical advisers were able to set right—because, as I hope to shew in due course, they never suspected the real seat of the trouble, namely *eye-strain*, though he himself came very near it in a letter to F. Heine of the last day of April: "Cure your stomach for sake of your eyes." A singular anticipation of one of the most modern of medical discoveries: the correlation is recognised, though the layman reverses effect and cause. Had his own doctors but followed up the clue, instead of dosing him with every sort of mineral water etc., it is possible that alike stomach and nerves might have been repaired for good and all.*

Small good was he to derive from the present variant of the Albisbrunn treatment of two years back. It really was a little 'life' he needed, and St Moritz was a very different place in those days from the fashionable resort it became three decads later; a primitive mountain village, with surroundings which Wagner describes as "majestic, but void of charm." At first he made a few excursions with Herwegh, who writes to Frau Emma the 18th July: "We crossed the Julier in sunshine, of which there is less to be seen here; which may considerably curtail Wagner's stay. To-day we drove a few miles out, to Samaden, Bevers, Zutz, to get a glimpse of the Bernina. It would not shew itself, however; so we intend to make a direct assault on it. . . . Thor's hammer has arrived, and I shall set myself stone-breaking."

Sunday the 24th the "direct assault," or frontal attack on the Bernina is apparently delivered, for both friends write about a glacier expedition on that day. Herwegh's letter, to his wife, is the later of the two, but I will take it first, as it yields us an instructive peep behind their newly-drawn domestic curtain:—

HERWEGH to his wife: "St Moritz, 31. July 1853.

"My dear treasure!

I do not write, since I am furious—and this time with myself. I despise myself for my boundless cowardice, which has not allowed me hitherto to tear myself away. But have no care; the wishing-purse will come to end, and then it must be.

---

* Provisionally I refer the reader to a chapter on Wagner's ill-health in Dr Geo. M. Gould's *Biographic Clinics* (vol. ii—1904), since publication whereof I have obtained conclusively confirmatory evidence from a well-known oculist whom the master consulted in later life.

"The cookery, that so amuses you, is really most innocent of nature.* If one devours roots instead of grass, as the other mortals here—what does it matter? I leave Wagner the pleasure of curing himself thoroughly ill for once—then he'll have had enough of it, and be rid of his hypochondria into the bargain. In one thing I'm the opposite of him—he busies himself solely with himself; I no longer busy myself with myself at all.

"We have taken many walks—also an almost perilous tour on the glaciers, which I obstinately deferred till the Sunday, though Wagner insisted on the Saturday. There's grist to your mill. Regarding your Italian singer, Wagner confesses his complete dearth of advice. At Dresden there was formerly a capital singing-master, Della Casa, or some such name; but Wagner does not know what has become of him. Garcia in Paris, also teacher of Johanna Wagner, is in any case the most distinguished to be found in the five parts of the globe.

"If I could only tell you how glad I shall be, to be sitting in the diligence once more. Treasure, dear treasure. And I know that my last letter gave you joy. See! I am experiencing it all again. Minna says it is long since Wagner has written so affectionately. That also I understand!

---

* To this "most innocent *Kocherei*" the writer of the *Gegenwart* article already-mentioned (76 *ant.*) appends a preposterous gloss. Instead of obtaining from Frau Emma Herwegh the text of the allusion that had so "amused" her in her husband's previous letter (presumably still extant), he acts as her mouthpiece for the following interpretation: "For an understanding of the 'Kocherei' it should be explained that Wagner, who notoriously loved the most recherché luxury in the pleasures of the table too, had the costliest dainties sent him weekly by Frau Minna—an epicurism which Herwegh did not share, and for which the frugal Liszt was fond of twitting his sybaritic friend." With amazing coolness the boot is clapped on the wrong leg, for no one but Frau Herwegh's mouthpiece has ever accused Wagner of being a Lucullus; whereas we read in Baechtold's *Gottfried Keller* (I. 328) of the "extravagance" of Georg Herwegh, who in the forties "was addicted to the most exquisite bodily pleasures, drank nothing but champagne (even when in deep financial embarrassments, to Keller's disgust), kept liveried servants" and so on. It was a pious act of Herwegh's widow, no doubt, to seize the first opportunity of repelling Baechtold's strictures, yet nothing but personal animosity can have dictated their gratuitous transference to her late husband's friend; for the sense of Herwegh's remarks on the "cookery" is perfectly clear, namely that *he* couldn't put up with the diet of "the other mortals here," and left Wagner to martyrise himself with the distasteful fare. On the other hand, if there is any truth in the story of Minna's sending a weekly packet, its contents may be easily guessed: her famous *Zwiebäcke*—biscuits specially prepared for a poor stomach unable to support the weight of bread.—Of such are the "unfavourable sources" for declining to drink whereat the *Gegenwart* condemns friend Glasenapp (77*n ant.*).

"I have so many withered flowers lying on my table, that I pluck a leaf at random, in token that, wherever I have been, I have ever been with thee.

"Our boy is to sing, sing much, until he can begin the violin. To produce tones oneself, not have them given to one ready-made, as by the piano—believe me, that determines whether a human being has the musical sense at all.

THY GEORG."

I might have omitted a sentence or two from the above, as not directly concerning us, though printed at length in *Die Gegenwart;* but it was fairer to all parties, to reproduce the whole. Here we certainly have what the cynical Schopenhauer would have called "Wodan under the slipper." Herwegh has to feign remorse at not "tearing himself away" from the friend whose solitude he had deliberately set forth to share, and the only way in which he can mollify his exacting spouse at home is to poke a little quiet fun at the companion who has borne him from her side. In Frau Emma's eyes Wagner would occupy much the same position as the bachelor-friends a bride so commonly insists on her husband gently shedding, since they menace her undisputed sway; therefore the friend must be run down just a little, to elevate the scale in which the moneyed wife reclines. And as if in reply to an uxorial "Assert yourself!" we have a cock-a-doodle-doo over the triumphant observance of Saturday, when nothing beyond a 'Sabbath-day's journey' may be made by Frau Emma's kindred: "There's grist to your mill." Observe, however, that it is the "egoist" who gives way.—Surely this is either an actually or an actorly different Georg Herwegh from the friend whom Wagner had described to Uhlig last October as "more sympathetic, in every respect, than any physician!" If Herwegh disbelieved in the efficacy of this vaunted 'cure,' he was right; but what had become of his "great knowledge of physics and physiology" (cf. iii, 268) when he could disbelieve in the malady? Could he not so much as guess that, if a man cannot write a few lines of a letter without racking pain or dizziness in his head, there must be some pathologic cause;* that he is ill, almost hopelessly ill,

* Only five days before this letter of Herwegh's, Wagner had written Liszt about Köhler's *Melodie der Sprache:* "The silly fellow wanted to hear something from me about his book; but as soon as ever I bend my head to *theory*, my brain-nerve takes to aching violently, and I become thoroughly ill." Un-

however robust in appearance, until that cause is traced and remedied? "Hypochondria" will not explain, still less cure it. Must we give a new reading to the scriptural text, and say, A 'brain-fag' sufferer hath no sympathy in his own country or from his closer friends? Or is it merely that Georg Herwegh has to pose as callous toward his comrade when writing to a wife whose antipathy for the latter clearly approaches that of Francisca von Bülow? The reader must decide; but let him not miss the manifest message from Wagner in that closing sentence which outweighs the whole of Herwegh's letter.

It is Wagner's turn now, and the change of tone is refreshing. July 26 he writes Liszt: "I'm living in a savage desert: ice and snow all round me; half of the day before yesterday we spent among the glaciers. Herwegh has got to hold out: I won't let him slip the leash, but mean to make him work. Yesterday he swore me that he had your poem well advanced in his head." No farther than "his head" did Herwegh's text for Liszt ever get; yet that is the man "no longer busied with myself at all," in such virtuous contrast to his ailing friend. Nor is Wagner himself too happy in his wilderness, for he further tells Liszt, "The only thing I'm thinking of, is how to see you once again this year. I wish you could give me a rendezvous in Paris after the Carlsruhe festival"—a proposal that crosses a kindred suggestion by Liszt, of the 25th, "If it would not inconvenience you too much, do arrange that I (and several others) may meet you after Carlsruhe—perhaps at Basle—and come to life again for another few days, Lohengrin days we will call them. It will be good for both of us, to see one another once more." The 27th a more palpable growl is uttered, to old Fischer: "Here I sit, twixt ice and bears: who loved me, would fetch me away!—Until August 14 I must stay here, though." By now the local Aquarius had denied his victim the only thing to make such existence supportable: "At first I took trips with Georg to the glaciers and neighbouring valleys; but as that wouldn't fit in with the cure, I was confined in the end to this den, which I'm happy

---

doubtedly it was the reading and writing—the "bending of the head"—more than the thinking, that caused the trouble; but Herwegh might have recognised the reality of the effect at least.—N.B. Wagner's letter to Köhler already referred to (84 *ant.*), written on the very day of the glacier excursion, is of so much interest that I must reproduce it in the Appendix.

to say I leave the day after tomorrow"—he writes about August 10 *—"Whether the cure has done me any good, the result must shew : on the whole, I have no desire to repeat it ; I'm too restless to be able to abstain for long from all activity : in short, I am no 'cure' subject—I have found out that. Now I'm burning to get to Italy."

This desire of Italy was of long standing. Last year, in the throes of his great poem, we have seen him skim the borders of the lakes, and return home none the better in body. Yet he has been longing to renew the experience ever since, as we find in letter after letter ; e.g. May 30, "At the end of August I shall go to *Italy*, so far as it lies open to me (ah ! were that but as far as Naples ! ! The King of Saxony could do it). Ways and means I must procure, even if it came to stealing !" An operatic fee or two—50 louis in advance of the Hamburg *Tannhäuser* royalties, and an unspecified amount for the performing-right of *Lohengrin* from Leipzig—rendered theft unnecessary. But the object ? It was no mere idle pleasure, but to drink from the Mediterranean a flood of melody for his waiting drama. To Wesendonk he writes in June, just three weeks after steeping himself in the harmonies of his earlier works : "My first object is to recuperate myself thoroughly, so that—after a five-year pause in music-writing—I may regain the needful youthfulness to set about my new gigantic task with zest and good cheer. I have to close a whole long chapter in my life, to begin a new important one. For that I need fresh life-impressions : I need a certain saturation from without, to turn my inside out with joy once more. So I must be free to travel, enjoy Italy, perhaps also visit Paris again, thereafter to arrive at that repose of mind which fails me now" ; and immediately before St Moritz, "The cure once happily over, then on to Italy. Ruled paper for sketches is all in readiness, and ere the end of this year I fancy the composition of Rheingold will be completely drafted." That remains to be seen, and the last letter (to Liszt) from the place of 'cure' already exhibits a doubt : "How long I shall wander in Italy, heaven knows : perhaps I shan't be able to stand it long *alone;* yet the thought of returning to Switzerland so soon is distasteful to me at present." Alone it must be, however, since "Minna also is

* Letter 121 in th *W.-L. Corr.*, undated. As already observed, the letters of these two or three weeks have been printed in an obviously wrong order.

not well: she's under treatment, and returns to the baths; her blood and nerves are in an uproar" (to Fischer, Aug. 17).

So the trip, to which he has looked forward so many months, is to be commenced in the reverse of inspiriting conditions. "I'm in a miserable state," he writes Liszt Aug. 16, "and find it hard to persuade myself that, rather than continue thus, it would not really be more moral to put an end to this abominable life. Dreary desolation and cheerlessness from morn till night: that is a sample of the days that go to constitute this life of mine!!!" His itinerary he maps out as if it were a penance: "The evening of the 24th I start from here, and shall reach Turin the 29th at latest, whither you could address me poste restante [he proposed staying a few days in this centre of more active 'life']. Genoa, Spezzia, Nice etc., will hold me then until I know for certain where to go to meet you. The Carlsruhe journal says that the music-festival is postponed to October: would that involve the deferring of our rendezvous? If you can't come to Paris, I shall come in any case to you at Basle." Thus the prospect of seeing Liszt again predominates.

From Berne, the first stage en route to Italy, Aug. 25: "Everything else retires into the shade before our Paris rendezvous, to which you have so splendidly assented . . . I am much pulled down, suffering with insomnia—the difficulties about a French visa completely upset me, as I should so like to meet you in Paris." The Italian expedition has begun under bad auspices, for Wagner had tried in vain to get his passport visé in Berne for the future trip to Paris, and the uncertainty hangs like a cloud over the next five weeks (see letters 126 to 132 in the W.-L. group). Curiously enough, this passport difficulty brings us into relation again with Berlioz, who had quite recently written Liszt, "I am as convinced as you of the ease with which Wagner and I might get into gear, if he would only oil his wheels," and so on. Liszt had passed that message on to Wagner, who replies in this letter from Berne that Berlioz, albeit "a strange customer" (*ein närrischer Kauz*), is "a noble fellow," and adds that he has just made use of Berlioz' name to reassure the political agents as to the objects of his desired visit to Paris.

But the Italian journey? "*After* your visit, everything went

awry with me this summer: no other hope was to be fulfilled; all turned out wrong." The St Moritz 'cure' had manifestly proved a dismal failure, and wrecked the holiday that was to follow. In less than three weeks the latter is ended, for we read under date Sept. 12: "Here I am back in Zurich—unwell, out of humour—ready to die!—At Genoa I became ill, felt a horror at my loneliness, yet forced myself on and went to Spezzia; my illness increased, enjoyment was out of the question. So I turned back—to give up the ghost, or compose—one or the other: nothing else is left me.—There you have the history of my journey—of *my* 'Italian travels'!" And to Roeckel (next Jan.): "The end of August I went to Italy, Turin, Genoa, Spezzia; I had meant to go on to Nice, and stay there awhile; but precisely in those foreign parts I felt my solitude so horribly, that I suddenly fell into a profound melancholy—in consequence also of a purely bodily sickness—and could not travel home fast enough, viâ the Lago Maggiore and S. Gothard." Insomnia, of which he already complained at Berne by no means for the first time, appears to have clung to him for a good two months (see Liszt's inquiry of the end of October); this time it becomes historic, through the open letter to Boito of eighteen years hereafter, "Be it a good or evil genius that often rules us in our hours of crisis—stretched sleepless in a hostelry at Spezzia, there came to me the prompting of my music for 'Rheingold,' and I returned at once to carry out that extensive work whose fate now binds me more than aught to Germany" (*P.* V. 287).

Not exactly yet, however, since he returned to Zurich in no fit state for composition: "My God, I'm so terribly—abandoned by God! I'm so alone,* and yet do not want to see anyone: what an atrocious existence! . . . Do arrange for us to meet *soon*—otherwise I shall get iller and iller!" Whatever inspiration for his music had come in the silent watches of the night, must still remain brooding in silence. Was it that, perhaps, which helped to make him sleepless? Was it the stirring of a mighty chord within, that made him so restless without? The inner workings of genius we can never hope to explore to the bottom; yet this

* Minna herself is still away on her 'cure,' as her husband tells Liszt, Sept. 22, that he visits her at the baths from time to time.

seems another of those elemental nerve-storms such as had preceded the conception of the big poem itself and the execution of its prologue in particular. Outwardly it appears but fret and stagnation, for—apart from necessary business correspondence, and of course his letters to Liszt—we know of very little (see 192 *inf.*) that he does in these three weeks of waiting for the rendezvous, beyond replying (Sept. 17) to a letter in which Spohr had sent him a friendly report of the repeated successes of *Tannhäuser* at Cassel, where the fine old gentleman had produced that opera the 15th of May.* His whole thoughts are centred on that second meeting with Liszt: "A week from the day after tomorrow we shall see each other! would it were the day after tomorrow!" and finally, Oct. 2, "the day after tomorrow I can say 'The day after tomorrow!'" No words could be more eloquent alike of his isolation and his longing for reunion with a friend whom he had told so recently, "If things are to go sensibly, you must stay in Switzerland often—then go they *will!*"

While that "day after tomorrow" is still not "to-day" we will shift our scene, for the Carlsruhe festival came between—a much more important affair than that at Ballenstedt last year, since it is the absolutely first enterprise of the kind in Southern Germany.

The new Intendant at the capital of Baden was an old Dresden friend of Wagner's (see vol. ii). Their relations had not been very actively maintained since the rebellion, yet Wagner had suggested to Liszt so long ago as May '51: "A man like Eduard Devrient would be invaluable for the formation of your Weimar company, as he *knows* what is wanted. I admit the difficulty of acquiring such a man." At the end of that year Wagner also expressed to Uhlig a wish to hear something of or from Devrient: "I confess I often find myself thinking of him, and am curious to know how far a man like that lags behind through his want of inner energy and genuine courage, and on the other hand, how far he is to be drawn forward through his good intellect and honest will"; item, he is first to read the *Communication.* Uhlig gives a disappointing account of Devrient's attitude toward the master's writings, and of course their author boils up (letters 57 and 63, Spring '52), though he still admits capacity: "Devrient has gone far in his own pro-

* Repetitions May 22, June 10, Aug. 1 and 23, Sept. 2, and so on.

fession, and it is just that which has made him so stubbornly vain. With such people one must tumble their whole profession about their ears, before one can hope to succeed with them ; nor is that success to be attained, in the long run, except by downright murder." It does not come to bloodshed, however—merely to inkshed : "E. D. has written me"—July '52, with the *Walküre* poem completed the day before—"Now I'm in for it. To my horror I find the man far shallower than I had anticipated . . . *E. D. defends music against—me !* Isn't that lovely ? He takes a highly proper stand on 'harmonies of the spheres' and 'sighings of the soul' ! !—Well, well, I've slung a pretty millstone round my neck : for, with all his silliness, this man has something respectable and true-hearted—I recognise it—that makes one sorry to have to kick him.—All the same, I'll write him : tell him that, with my greetings meanwhile." In such cases Wagner's bark was generally worse than his bite ; probably he sent quite a pleasant letter, as the next we hear is from Liszt Oct. '52 : "Eduard Devrient visited me here last month. We spoke much about you, and I hope he will bring forth good fruit in Carlsruhe later"—meaning, in the way of mounting Wagner's operas. But Devrient's good fruit takes a long time ripening. Though the new court-theatre is opened in May '53, and *Tannhäuser* secured in June,* not till January '55 does that opera attain its Carlsruhe première—a foretoken of the miscarriage of the *Tristan* negotiations a few years later.

Not this lukewarm former associate, was the originator of the Carlsruhe Festival ; to Liszt and his friend Count Leiningen accrues the credit of initiative, to the Prince Regent that of willing patronage. True, Liszt tells Wagner Dec. 27, '52 : "Eduard Devrient wrote me a few days back, that Hofmarschall Graf Leiningen, with whom I stand in friendly relations, had spoken to him about the plan of a music-festival, the direction whereof would fall to me" ; but Devrient's own letter to Liszt of the 10th sets the matter in its proper light : "Hofmarschall Graf von Leiningen has opened me the agreeable prospect of coöperation with you in getting up a music-festival that promises a splendid

* See Wagner's letter of July 1, '53, to Fischer, directing the "new ending" to be added to a full score "*at once* for Carlsruhe." Sept. 22 he writes Liszt, "How are things going at Carlsruhe ? D. has again not answered a letter of mine—presumably because I asked him to get the fee for Tannhäuser paid me in advance, as I had reason for some anxiety about my incomings."

flower to our newly-budding art-life. Accept my good wishes for our common action, and my assurance that I will do all I can for the thing. Only, the provisional plan you discussed with Count Leiningen must undergo some modification in point of time, owing to the opening of our new theatre* . . . Let me know your exact artistic proposals as soon as possible, so that I may fit in the preparations with my other work. You can scarcely conceive the mountain of business that weighs upon me, and will weigh still more heavily by the Spring. . . . I often think with pleasure of the day I spent with you at Weimar, and am the more delighted at the prospect of seeing you here for once. Of late I have been so buried in my own labours, that I have been unable to take a glance at those of others . . . Of Wagner I hear nothing, near as I am to him." The casualness of this solitary reference to the Zurich exile proves that Devrient, at least, had no conception as yet of the festival's true purpose; a purpose revealed to us by the fact that Liszt at once asks Wagner to advise him as to pieces for the programme.

Passing forward to the summer of 1853, on his journey to and from Zurich we have seen Liszt busied at Carlsruhe about this festival, which seems to have been definitely settled on the latter occasion, for he writes from Frankfort July 12 to beg for a loan of the Zurich band-parts of the *Tannhäuser* overture and *Lohengrin* pieces, to be sent direct to Devrient: "The two festival concerts will combine the theatrical choirs and bands of Darmstadt, Mannheim and Carlsruhe. As the theatre holds no more than an audience of 14 to 15 hundred, an orchestra of 190 [?] and a chorus of 160 will probably sound quite well . . . I hope Frau Heim will take this opportunity of making her appearance as *feuilletoniste* in Zurich." Concerning the Zurich excerpts a good deal of correspondence passes between the two protagonists, but it will suffice to quote Liszt's words of July 25, "I guarantee you a correct and spirited rendering of the Tannhäuser-overture and Lohengrin pieces, and promise you nothing but satisfaction with the result."

Hans von Bülow here makes his re-entry on our boards, with an intimation to his mother, July 26: "I must get to the Carlsruhe festival, even if I have to drag myself there barefoot. For

* Its ancestor had been burnt down Feb. 28, 1847, with a loss of 64 lives.

this is no chimera, but a very real thing; and its promoter is no innkeeper this time [as at Ballenstedt], but the Prince Regent of Baden. If I only could get an appointment in Carlsruhe! They have no conductor of any name." Poor Hans had been roughing it, since he blossomed into a touring virtuoso at the beginning of the year as "the heir and successor of Liszt" (the latter's own denomination of him). In Vienna he had given two concerts in March, making no particular sensation and a disastrous monetary loss; the Viennese had no ears just then for anything but the violin of Teresa Milanollo, whose enterprising father had booked every serviceable date. At Pressburg, on a flying visit, he succeeded a little better, and pocketed—half a sovereign. Returning to Vienna, he vainly sought an opportunity of retrieving his ill-fortune, till he abandoned the attempt and went to Buda-Pesth. Here he gained his first artistic victory the first of June, followed by two or three other appearances that reaped him still more kudos, but left his purse as empty as before. No wonder he longed to exchange the virtuoso-pilgrim's staff for a conductor's, however humble the appointment.—Then Liszt invites him to assist at Carlsruhe, to his infinite gratitude, and they meet again at last in Dresden. Here the young man plays in the theatre, to the satisfaction even of the redoubtable Carl Banck and the delight of his teacher, whom he accompanies viâ Leipzig (*Lohengrin* pourparlers for Liszt) to Weimar for a day, en route for Carlsruhe, which they reach together Sept. 18.

Liszt himself had scarcely had a quiet time since he got home after his Zurich visit. Hardly had he settled down to a little well-earned repose, than Egeria called him to her side at Carlsbad, the end of July, where they remained till the middle of August; then Teplitz, Dresden and Leipzig, at which point their roads diverge awhile, the sight-seeing Princess taking her daughter to Munich. Arrived at Carlsruhe, hard work awaits him: "From the aspect of things, there will be no time to lose, if the festival is to be a success"—he writes Carolyne next day—"From to-morrow I shall have to run about to Baden,* Darmstadt, Heidel-

* Berlioz, who had recently given a most successful concert at Baden, writes Liszt Sept. 3: "I believe you will be contented with the Carlsruhe artists, but if you need an *incomparable* trombone, horn and cornet, don't forget the names of MMrs Rome, Baneux and Arban (3 Frenchmen) who are in Mr Bénazet's band at Baden."

berg and Mannheim, picking up my people"; and the 22nd, from Darmstadt, "I have commenced my *pastoral* tour in honour of our festival, which is fixed for the 3rd and 5th October. In an hour I shall be at Mannheim, and back at Carlsruhe this evening. The day before yesterday I was at Baden, where I renewed acquaintance with Mme Kalergis. . . . I shall return to Baden in two or three days." Then the 23rd, "The *Musikfest* is beginning to give me a terrible amount of work, but I hope it will succeed beyond all expectations. Enclosed is the definitive programme. Tomorrow morning I go to Darmstadt, and the day after to Mannheim. Friday I shall be at Baden [yes, but *this* Friday, to-day], to see Mme Kalergis again—whose letter I forward you. Saturday [Oct. 1] I have my first general rehearsal with the full company"; and the 26th, "I will send you the new programme tomorrow. Wednesday and Thursday I shall be obliged to go to Darmstadt and Mannheim, not returning here till late on Thursday evening."

The object of this continual rushing to and fro Liszt explains to Wagner on Sunday the 25th: "To-day my rehearsals here commence, and I shall have to go to Darmstadt and Mannheim again, to hold separate rehearsals there, till we finally arrive at the full rehearsals here next Saturday.—Moreover, I have a mass of people of all sorts, known and unknown, *to wait upon*.—Are not your wife and Madame Heim coming to the festival?—Let me know in case they still intend to, as tickets will be difficult to obtain at the last moment." Minna, as we know, was under medical treatment, and Frau Heim apparently declined to go without her friend.

As for the people whom Liszt had "*to wait upon*"—the italics are his, "*aufzuwarten*"—it was a weakness dating from many years back, when fame first placed one of his feet in the world of "high fashion." The 24th he had written Carolyne from Baden: "I returned here yesterday, where reside the diplomatic corps of Carlsruhe, with the intention of paying three calls, on Russia, France and Austria, and of passing a few hours with Mme Kalergis. . . . I dined at the club, which represents the 'high fashion' of the place. . . . Madame Kalergis quite obviously rules the roast in this world, but with modesty enough. She shews tact and good taste in her relations with myself, which she frankly places on a footing of conventional friendship rather

flattering to me." Without attempting to clear up private allusions, I may say that Liszt had first met this niece of the Russian Chancellor Nesselrode at Warsaw ten years back, and that we shall soon re-encounter her in Paris. With the other celebrities seen by Liszt at Baden we need not linger, saving to remark that he evidently devotes part of his leisure to Wagnerising them; for he writes young Bülow the 23rd to despatch Hermann to him with a few printed compositions of Liszt's own and the pianoforte score of *Lohengrin*. On the other hand, the same letter requests the local Kapellmeister Kalliwoda to replace him in the two (first?) Carlsruhe rehearsals of "the Tannhäuser overture, Ninth Symphony etc., tomorrow"; scarcely a satisfactory equivalent.

From Bülow we have a racy characterisation of the natives' attitude toward this incursion of the "musicians of the future." Richard Pohl having been invited by Liszt to act as reporter, and his newly-married wife (Jeanne Eyth) to take the harp parts, Hans writes him Sept. 20: "Your presence here will be both 'utilis' and 'dulcis' in a high degree. The Carlsruher must have their hides tanned, in an insinuating, *i.e.* a Pohlish way. The 'Sonderkünstler' of this place, the specific musicians, rejoice in so paradisaic a simplicity, so chaste an immunity from the Ninth Symphony, Tannhäuser etc., that they very much need instruction about *this* specific music by a non-specific musician. The absolutely only thing Carlsruhe has brought forth by its own exertions is Gluck's Armida, which will be given here on the 30th; you will arrive, I fancy, a little earlier. . . . Kalliwoda and Conzertmeister Will, fairly exclusive adherents of the most antiquated Mendelssohnianism, entertain some prejudices as regards the programme. Liszt having gone off to Mannheim and Darmstadt, they honoured me with their confidences on this point—less so Kalliwoda, who is a very charming fellow." Bülow's bright gossip comes to a premature end, however; for, in the midst of all the preparations a terrible blow befalls him. Six months earlier his father had been seized with an apoplectic stroke, full recovery from which had been retarded by grief at the death (Apr. 28) of his old friend and leader Ludwig Tieck. Sept. 16 Eduard von Bülow passed suddenly and painlessly away, but his son did not receive the news till the 24th*: "Joachim, whom

* Liszt writes his princess the evening of Sept. 22: "Hans's father has just died" (that is all). Hans writes his mother the 25th: "Yesterday afternoon

I had not seen for long,* Liszt, and also Pruckner (who stood by me in the first shock of it), have all been very kind to me." Next day Hans starts for Ötlishausen in Switzerland, to arrange his father's books and papers, and offer comfort to his widow; then, after barely two days beside the cherished resting-place, to set out again for Carlsruhe, where inexorable duty claims him: "On Sunday morning Liszt expects me back. I promised him to play a composition of his on Wednesday, Oct. 5, and I will brace myself to do it."

The two festival concerts being fixed for the 3rd and 5th of October at 11 A.M., the general rehearsals were held on the 1st, 2nd and 4th, as Pohl tells us in the *Neue Zeitschrift:* "The three bands had never played together before, and even nursed a certain rivalry. Beyond the choral and [string] quartet rehearsals, very little preliminary work could be done; consequently a combined musical mass of 260 persons had to be familiarised in 48 hours with works not one of them had heard before. As the scaffolding for the band was erected on the stage itself, rehearsals could only be held in the morning hours. After each rehearsal the whole apparatus was pulled down, and re-erected after each theatrical performance—a perfect labour of Hercules, the successful execution whereof redounds to the honour of the Director, Eduard Devrient." As regards the constitution of the orchestra, Pohl enumerates the strings alone: "32 violins, 10 violas, 8 celli and 8 double basses"; of the 'wind' he merely says that it was not so good, especially the wood-wind, with exception of one flute. From these figures it is clear that Liszt's original estimate of 190 (unless it be a misprint) was far above the mark —about 100 would be nearer it; whereas his "chorus of 160" would be more accurate than Pohl's "at least 200 amateur voices," if "260" was the actual total. In any case, an im-

I read it in the Allgemeine Zeitung. Liszt had received your letter on the 22nd, but said nothing to me, took the letter to Baden, where he remained two days, and only on his return last night did your lines afford me mournful confirmation of what I could hardly believe on the word of the printed paper, so swift and staggering was the blow."

* Joachim to Liszt, Sept. 9: "To see the 'Weimar school' assembled in full energy and joy, will be more than a mere musical festival to me, and I hope we younger members shall bear away a splendid spur to fresh activity." Joachim had left the Weimar orchestra for a higher position in that of Hanover on the turn of 1852-3, soon to cut himself adrift from the 'school' entirely.

posing body of sound to deal with, yet risky with so few combined rehearsals.

Decidedly eclectic were the two programmes. Oct. 3 the first part commenced with the *Tannhäuser* overture, followed by 2) Concert-aria, Beethoven—Frau Howitz-Steinan; 3) Violin-concerto, composed and played by Joachim; 4) Finale of *Loreley*, Mendelssohn—Frau H.-S. Second Part, 5) Overture to *Manfred*, Schumann: 6) Liszt's *Künstler* cantata, to Schiller's words; 7) Beethoven's Ninth Symphony.—On the 5th the concert opened with Meyerbeer's *Struensee* overture*; 2) Aria from Mozart's *Titus*, Frl. Kathinka Heinefetter†; 3) Bach's Chaconne—Joachim; 4) Liszt's Fantasia for pianoforte and orchestra on themes from Beethoven's *Ruins of Athens*—von Bülow. Second Part, 5) Second movement of Berlioz' *Romeo;* 6) Aria, Fides, from last act of *Prophète*—K. Heinefetter; 7) the whole Zurich selection from *Lohengrin:* 8) Overture to *Tannhäuser*, repeated by desire. —Just as at Ballenstedt in '52, Berlioz had been retrenched to make more room for Wagner, the concert-bills having announced Movements two *and* three of the *Romeo* symphony.

An additional Wagnerian flavour had been imparted to the festival by the printing not only of Wagner's explanations of his own instrumental pieces, but also of his old Dresden "programme" for the Ninth Symphony. Pohl gave them further publicity by reprinting them in a "Carlsruhe Festival" brochure. Interesting enough as an historic document (as which it now appears in P.'s collected writings), the immediate purpose of this tract is by no means self-evident, since it is little more than a replica of the author's reports that had appeared in the *Neue Zeitschrift* but a few weeks earlier. Liszt, however, insisted on the reproduction (see his letter of Nov. 1 to Bülow), and prefaced the brochure with a signed letter (dated Nov. 5, '53, the full text is contained in La Mara's collection). From this letter it appears that various

* Liszt had caused a personal invitation to be sent to the composer, who politely declines, as "I have just commenced the rehearsals of a new opera of mine [*L'Etoile du Nord*], which will not permit my absenting myself from Paris" (*Br. h. Ztgn*).

† Mentioned with high praise in Wagner's Paris articles of 1841; see *Prose Works* VIII., 77 and 138. Though little more than a débutante then, her voice had already lost much of its beauty by 1853, according to Pohl's contemporary account of the festival. German training?—This lady's pieces were her own choice.

newspapers had found fault with Liszt's conducting, though they acknowledged the festival to have been "a success on the whole." In view of all the circumstances it was bad policy for the conductor himself to descend into the arena,* and the magisterial tone he adopts was little calculated to silence carpers; but the wisest of us may make mistakes at times.

Immediately before that ill-judged open letter, Liszt's services were rewarded by the Prince Regent of Baden with the cross of "Commander of the order of Zähringen," and one cannot but feel that all these crosses,† orders and interviews with grandees, had a tendency to turn the honest artist's head. So much the better for him to be making straight from Carlsruhe to Basle, to meet the never-decorated Wagner.

"For our *rendez-vous* I earnestly beg you to present yourself at Basle the evening of the 6th. Joachim, Pohl, and apparently several others, have the keenest desire to see you, and I have promised to conduct them to you at Basle. Gladly would I come again to Zurich—but am too much pressed for time.—So Basle at the Stork or the Three Kings, as you shall command" (Liszt, Sept. 25). "Will you—or shall I book the hotel? At the Three Kings there are nice rooms with a balcony over the Rhine: some of those should be engaged. You must be in the thick of your exertions now, and yet I almost envy you; only in such exertions do *I*, at least, grow aware that I'm alive. Rest is death to me, how oft I seek it; yet that other rest, the blissful, that also could be solely death—but a true, complete and noble death; not this death in life I die daily!" (Wagner, Sept. 29).

Full of youthful ardour and elation, 'Young Weimar' was being brought by its worshipped chief to pay homage to a greater than himself. Liszt's retinue was to consist of Hans von Bülow, Joseph Joachim, Peter Cornelius, Dionys Pruckner, the Hun-

* Pohl's remark on the small opportunity for general rehearsals might well have stood for all the exculpation needed. In three full rehearsals it would have been impossible for Wagner himself to do justice to two long concert-bills so packed with unfamiliar works. A break-down in the execution of the Ninth, and "similar accidents," are admitted even by Liszt's panegyrist, L. Ramann.

† Sixty-three is the number of orders recorded with pride by his last pupil and secretary, August Göllerich.

garian violinist Rémenyi, and Richard Pohl. Cornelius thus recalls the event: "What lessons we learnt at the rehearsals for the grand music-performances; what wonders we experienced at Liszt's ear, his controlling hand, the mode in which he explained, inspired, electrified! . . . How merry were our evenings, blithe our nights! The motive of the Flying Dutchman was our password in the starless dark, the Royal fanfare from Lohengrin our goodnight call to Liszt, and the jubilant trombone-melody before the 3rd act of Lohengrin we sang as first greeting to the longed-for Meister Wagner when we sought the exile out in Switzerland." Pohl adds the more prosaic detail: "Wagner dared not cross the frontier,—that we knew, and also knew that all visitors to Wagner would be watched and examined at the frontier, as we experienced to our amusement on our return."

Wagner arrived first at the trysting-place. Waiting for the others in the hotel coffee-room, all his solitary broodings were dispelled by the half humorous, half "pompous entry" of Liszt and his young friends, to the strains of that theme from the *Lohengrin* entr'acte.* It was a memorable meeting, more especially for the younger men, none of whom except Bülow had ever seen the exile's face before; and the evening passed in the highest of spirits. Liszt himself was caught by the general air of fraternity, and pledged "Brüderschaft" with Hans in kirschwasser. Wagner is said to have been greatly pleased with Joachim, and to have tendered him also the brotherly "Du"; whilst the rising young violinist was so impressed by the recital of a portion of the Ring-poem, that he offered his services then and there for the first stage-performance of the work (see Andreas Moser's *Joseph Joachim* pp. 123-4).†

---

* The term "pompöser Einzug" is Liszt's own, in a letter of Dec. '55 where he recalls the Basle entry by a passing allusion, and also quotes the Royal fanfare as the "Hoch!" adopted by "our New-Weimar union"—namely that of the "Murls" or anti-philistines, with himself as "Padisha."

† When it came to the actual performance of the *Ring*, Wagner and Joachim had long ceased to be at one: this Basle encounter, in fact, was their only personal intercourse. Soon after it, Joachim writes Liszt (Apr. 13, '54): "I am really sorry that Berlioz has been prevented again, by his Brunswick concert, from hearing Lohengrin; I should have liked him to make the musical acquaintance of Wagner, whom he only knows from his theories. And how gladly would I myself have travelled to Weimar for the last performance (with Götze)! You certainly will have expected me—and had I not spent so

That recital did not take place till the following evening—Friday the 7th—by which time Princess Carolyne, her daughter Marie, and their cousin Eugene Wittgenstein, had also arrived from Carlsruhe, where they had joined Liszt for the festival. Reminiscences differ as to what section of the RING it was, that Wagner read at Basle: Pohl says the *Young Siegfried*, but "I clearly remember him also reading the Norns' scene then"; whereas La Mara, apparently on the princess's authority, names *Die Walküre*. Pohl also states that, after a great deal of pressing, the author gave his hearers a tiny foretaste of the music of *Rheingold*: "He played us Mime's song,* Alberich's spell, and a few other motives; but that was all." Even that was an unusual concession, as the actual composition had not yet been commenced.

It had long been Wagner's ambition to hear a worthy rendering of Beethoven's great sonata in B major, op. 106. At Basle Liszt played it him "in such a way as no one else has ever played it, or ever can," says Pohl, "and that on a very middling upright which we hunted up in haste." A few years afterwards, Wagner writes: "I ask all who have heard op. 106 and 111 of Beethoven played by Liszt, what they previously knew of those creations, and what they then discovered in them? . . . Liszt was the first to place the value and significance of the works of his forerunners in their fullest light, and thereby soared to nearly the same height as the composer he reproduced" (*P.* III. 241).

There naturally was some talk of the future "Nibelungen theatre," and Pohl remarks that Strassburg was suggested for its

much time and money the last few months on railways, I surely should have come" (*Br. h. Z.*). By a singular coincidence, the meeting of Wagner and Joachim synchronises with that of Schumann and Brahms, followed on the 28th of October '53 by Schumann's famous "Neue Bahnen" article in the *Neue Zeitschrift*. Joachim and Brahms immediately came into contact, and, though Liszt at first imagined that Brahms would be won to the 'Weimar school' (see his letter to Bülow, Dec. 16, '53), in less than seven years we find Brahms and Joachim signing a circular protest against the 'music of the future,' its leaders and disciples (see Bülow to Draeseke, May 6, 1860).

* Surely from *Siegfried*. Bülow to Cornelius a few days later, "your affectionate Mime," with an amusing souvenir of these youngsters' late commoning: "Joachim forgot his glasses, consequently will be suffering from stoppage of the eyes; you left your pocket-book behind . . . and Pruckner exchanged his dress-coat with mine, leaving in it 1) a red silk handkerchief, 2) a pocket brush with comb and mirror, 3) a pair and a half of black gloves. *Pauper ego! Pauperior Pruckner!*"

site, as lying just beyond the German frontier (then) and easy of access from all parts. Whether the idea was seriously entertained by Wagner, is another matter; inherently it is improbable, and he makes no allusion to it himself. On the 8th, however, the greater part of the company passes on to Strassburg; Wagner, Liszt, the three Wittgensteins, Joachim and Bülow, the latter of whom records to his mother, some three days after, "the sublime and uniquely imposing impression made on me by the cathedral; I still am happy in the thought of it." Here the two younger musicians diverge from the main party, which goes straight on to Paris. On the journey thither Wagner's feeling of delight at being once more with his beloved friend would appear to have overcome him, if we may judge by a letter of next summer (no. 159), "I can write no more, but much could I *say* to you, if another fit of weeping did not haply take me, as in the railway-carriage."

Late on Sunday the 9th, Wagner, Liszt and the Wittgensteins arrive in the French metropolis, and put up at the Hôtel des Princes, lunching and dining together each day (see L. to B., Nov. 1). The following morning Liszt visits his children, whom he has not seen for several years: Blandine, now aged 18, Cosima 16,* and Daniel 14. The evening of this 10th of October the little salon of the two sisters' governess, Mme Patersi, at 6 Rue Casimir Perrier held a notable gathering; Liszt's party was joined by Berlioz, and Wagner read aloud his *Siegfried's Tod*, thus completing a recital begun at Zurich last July—unless we are to suppose that Liszt was treated to the whole poem twice over. We are curious to know how Berlioz took it; perhaps he excused himself after the first act, as he certainly could not have followed a declamation in the native German, and Wagner, on the other hand, could not possibly have interpreted it in French—last month, in fact, he had remarked: "Paris is beginning to be almost disagreeable to my presentiments; I am afraid of Berlioz, I shall be lost with my bad French." No

* Ary Scheffer's portrait-group of the two graceful young ladies appears to have been commissioned during the present Paris episode; at any rate Liszt writes P^ss^ Wittgenstein next July: "Ary Scheffer is at Dortrecht, in the environs of Rotterdam, and I shall go to see him tomorrow or the next day. He has painted many portraits here, but none at a smaller price than that I still have on my conscience."

allusion to the recital is discoverable in Berlioz' correspondence, yet we have a sequel to the present visit to the Rue Casimir Perrier in a letter to Liszt of next May, "J'ai vu tes charmantes filles." The younger of Liszt's "charmantes filles" can have little dreamt that the music for this *Siegfried's Tod* would be written one day by her side; there is something almost prophetic in the fact that the composition of the giant work was begun within less than a month from this first unregarded meeting. To another juvenile member of the audience, however, was presented the copy whence Wagner had read; to the fairy "child" to whom kind messages are sent so often in the poet's subsequent letters to Liszt, P^ss^ Marie Wittgenstein, now also aged 16: its dedication runs, "Der Nibelungen Neid und Noth, der Wälsungen Wonn' und Weh', Alles dem klugen Kinde zum Andenken an dem dummen Richard" (see La Mara's note to p. 180 of *Franz Liszt's Briefe* IV).

No sooner did the German papers learn that Wagner and Liszt had gone to Paris together, than they jumped to their baseless conclusions: the object must be a production of *Tannhäuser*—'tis plain as a pikestaff—and at the Théâtre Lyrique, to give it a name; but luckily the police won't permit him to stop.* Nothing could have been farther from the composer's intention; *this* time he had simply come to Paris to enjoy himself: all the "tannhäusering" he did, was on the pianoforte, when he regaled Liszt's friend Mme Kalergis with fragments of his operas, as well as his fingers and shyness would let him. He had come to see and hear, and attended with Liszt a performance of Beethoven's last quartets in E flat and C sharp minor, to which he thus refers in after years: "Precisely these last quartets of Beethoven, still classed as complete enigmas by the great majority of German musicians, have long been executed in consummate style by a company of Frenchmen in Paris; and that result these artists owe to the diligence they have for years devoted to discovering the proper rendering. . . . They held no bar acquitted, no ever so insignificant-looking phrase, till they had mastered its last particle of melodic substance . . . and behold! these pieces

* Liszt to Bülow, Nov. 1: "It is a silly canard of the newspapers, that he was not allowed to remain more than 48 hours in Paris. We passed ten days together there . . . I can certify that there never was any question of annoyance by the police in his regard."

suddenly appear so fluent and engaging in their melody, that the most naïve audience fails to understand how they could have been accounted less intelligible than other compositions" (*P.* IV. 216).

Was Meyerbeer called on—not by Wagner, of course (after *Opera and Drama*), but by Liszt? The position would be a little awkward, as the call could scarcely be returned without the risk of stumbling against Liszt's friend.—Was anything more seen of Berlioz? That, again, I cannot answer; for that matter, we are left to our own imagination to fill up the sketch. The Opéra and a theatre or two we may certainly include in the entertainments of the party; whilst P^ss^ Carolyne would equally certainly insist on 'doing' the sights, the picture-galleries, and a studio or two. Then there would be a visit to the workshop of Alexandre, to try Liszt's new combination of grand pianoforte and harmonium, concerning which Berlioz had written at the beginning of September, "Your monster will be finished in a fortnight." Sittings also must have been given for that medallion portrait (98*n ant.*) a cast of which Liszt sends Köhler next June with the comment, "A friend of mine, Prince Eugene Sayn-Wittgenstein, modelled it last autumn in Paris, and I consider it the best existing likeness of Wagner." Thus time flew on wings, till one of those wings abruptly snapped. "Wagner and I passed ten days together in Paris"—writes Liszt to Bülow, Nov. 1—"and he remained there a few days after me to attend his wife, to whom he had given rendezvous for the 20th, calculating that I should stay for my birthday," i.e. the 22nd; but "my stay had to be abridged by a week, owing to pressing letters I received there from Weimar."* Liszt and the two princesses therefore leave Wagner behind on the 18th or 19th.

For his own sake, Wagner would probably have started back in the same train; but only on the 16th had he written Sulzer, begging a temporary loan to enable Minna to join him in Paris and "live a few days on the fat of the land where she once had hungered so" (see Steiner's brochure). Minna accordingly arrives

* To Wagner Oct. 31, "The poor princess sends kind regards. She is plagued with a mass of correspondence of the most unpleasant nature. God grant we may enter a new phase next summer — — and that our Zurich visit may not be postponed beyond June." Neither that Zurich visit, nor the "new phase" in Liszt's union, was destined to occur.

with the wherewithal on the day appointed, and passes a week in more or less familiar surroundings.

The incidents of this final Paris week—Oct. 20 to 27—are homely enough. "Your children told me they had had a letter from you, saying that you had all got very quickly back to Weimar, and hadn't seen a soul till your birthday. For my part, I made music on your birthday: to my two or three old Paris friends * (one of whom you had the pleasure of meeting!) I had to end by giving something of my own for once. I had an Erard grand brought in—which inspired me with the fanatical desire to fly away with such a *Flügel*, even if I had to learn five-fingering first! So I tannhäusered and lohengrined in the Boulevard des Italiens as tho' *you* three were there: the poor devils couldn't make out why I was so beside myself.—Anyhow, it went better than at the Kalergi's—notwithstanding that you *were* there then:—why?!—Apropos of Mme Kalergi, I did not see her again, after all; † a couple of lines will have made my apology, I think.—For the rest, I received the visit of an *Agent de Police*, who—after putting me through a successful examination—gave me the assurance that I might stay *a whole month* in Paris: my answer, that I should be leaving much sooner, quite astounded him, and he reiterated that I really might remain *one month*.—Ah, the good man! Ah, the dear Paris!—I had another sight of the Emperor: what more could one wish?" (written two days after reaching home again). Paris had lost all its charm for him when Liszt departed; even the day before his own departure, "I still am staring after you!—all my being is silence. . . . Nor have I much to tell you of the 'world.' . . . Be thanked for your beatifying love! Greet the princess and—the child. What more could I write? My brain has fled into my heart: from there I cannot *write* you" (Oct. 26).

His journey home is full of tender recollections of the journey out. A brief halt is made at each of the stages now eloquent of his late companion. At Strassburg "I saw the *minster* once more: my good wife stood beside me. It was a dismal, rainy day,—we could not see the godlike spire-top,—'t was veiled in

* E. Kietz, Anders—and? No third survivor from the old Paris days can we divine.

† Oct. 26: "I shall say goodbye to your children tomorrow. Mme Kalergi I have not found in: I doubt that I shall see her again. Make my excuses to her."

mist.—How different from erewhile, that hallowed Sunday before the minster." At Basle a chance encounter with the violinist Ernst renews the earlier associations of the place, for Ernst writes thus to Liszt a few weeks after: "I find myself in the great dead city of Carlsruhe, which some persons say seems doubly dead to all those who were privileged to attend the recent festival to which your presence gave such animation and lustre. From this city itself I wish to convey to you my regrets at not having been able to attend and profit by so rare an opportunity of hearing under your direction the creations of our great masters, and notably those of Wagner, which have found in you so valiant a champion and intelligent an interpreter. In saying this, dear Liszt, I simply repeat the expression of Wagner himself. I had the good fortune to see him at Basle on his way back from Paris to Zurich, and you may well believe that you furnished the principal subject of our conversation. His admiration for you did not at all astonish me; but it was a pleasure to see him thus imbued with gratitude for your truly loyal and artistic conduct toward him."

So the Zurich home is reached once more, about Oct. 29: "I got back here the day before yesterday. Peps welcomed me at the coach; in return I had brought him a beautiful collar engraved with his name, a name become so sacred to me [138 and 147 *ant.*]. He never quits my side now: of a morning he wakes me in bed; the dear good beast!"

V.

MUSICIAN AGAIN: *DAS RHEINGOLD.*

Incubation.—The music begun; deliberate harmonic simplicity; "plastic nature-motives."—"New method" of composing; not *at the pfte.—Financial straits: first attempt to sell the* Lohengrin *performing-rights.—Composition resumed and concluded.—Leipzig fiasco of* Lohengrin; *foils second attempt to dispose of rights, and leads to renewed desire of amnesty.—Epistle to Roeckel.—Scoring* Rheingold; *more Panharmonic concerts; fresh phases in scoring.—Munich flirts with* Tannhäuser.—*Freedom of speech toward Liszt; another heart's-cry.—Score completed.*

> *For five years I had written no music. . . . With what faith, what joy, I went to this! In a veritable fury of despair have I pursued it to its end. . . . This work is in truth the only thing that preserves me any taste for life. For its sake I must still hold out.*
>
> R. WAGNER (to Liszt, Jan. 1854).

"IN NIGHT and sorrow. *Per aspera ad astra.* God grant it!" had been the motto of the *Flying Dutchman* music (i, 327); "Let night come!—the stars shine then:—I look above, and lo!—for *me*, too, shines my star. . . . To-day the Rhinegold flowed already through my veins." Twelve years separate these two ejaculations, each of which heralds a fresh era in the author's musical life. Each is as if a solemn prayer addressed to his guardian spirit, and the solemnity of the later one is emphasised by that immediately-preceding reference to the "hallowed Sunday before the Strassburg Minster."

Three quarters of a year have passed since the poem of the RING DES NIBELUNGEN was committed to the printer's hands, a full nine months' gestation: no premature birth, for this child should be strong, a very Hercules. And what if little "whims" were

gratified in those nine months, small luxuries provided for the lying-in ! "If I am to plunge once more into the waves of fancy, to satisfy myself in an imagined world, at least my fancy must be fed, my imagination fostered. I cannot live like a dog at such a time, cannot make my bed on straw, refresh myself with fusel : I must feel myself stroked, as it were, if the labour of creating a non-existent world is to succeed by the sweat of my brow.— Well ! when I resumed the plan of actually carrying out my Nibelungen, there was much required to give me the needful sense of revelling in art :—I must be able to live better than of late. The successes of *Tannhäuser* (which I had made away in this very hope) were to help me now :—I refurnished my home, squandered (Heavens—squandered ! !) money on this and that luxurious need : *your* summer visit, eh ! — your example — all attuned me to a—forcedly—cheerful illusion respecting my circumstances. My incomings appeared to me something quite assured. In this artificial sense of ease I plucked up heart again for music. . . . To nobody but yourself can I make this plain avowal, as you are the only one who can understand my moods and likings, whims and wants, without shaking your head at them. What philistine can I ask to place himself in line with that prodigality (*das Überschwängliche*) of my nature which, under this or that prompting of life, has driven me to relieve a huge inner desire by outer means that must fail of his approval ? Nobody knows the needs of one of us : myself, I sometimes wonder at myself for thinking so many 'useless' things quite indispensable."

Written to Liszt (some ten weeks hence) in explanation of the financial pinch into which the writer has fallen, we may equally apply the above to his late apparent idleness. "Nobody knows the needs" of the creator of a RING DES NIBELUNGEN, not even Liszt entirely : no one but the 'double' of that creator himself *could* know them. Yet the philistine of to-day is in a better position to judge them, than the philistine of fifty years ago ; for we have the ulterior results before us. Had it been part of the contract, that the floor of their composer's study should be paved with gold, the twentieth-century world would not have thought it an excessive bargain for the notes of the tetralogy. When carpets and tea-chests can be turned into racehorses and racing yachts, to say nothing of titles, a few home-comforts and a jaunt or two seem cheap material for conversion into the music of a *Rheingold*.

And the nine fallow months? Reflect on the preparation and enrichment needed for the soil! Not *one* drama alone was to spring into tone, but a sequence of *four:* the whole tetralogy must begin to pulse with musical life, before its first sheet of notes could take definite shape. No wonder "fresh impressions" had been demanded, "the rain I need, if my plant is not to die of drought" (p. 123 *ant.*); "I lack but the needful *vitalising*, for the motives to well forth of themselves" (p. 119 *ant.*).

"Never have I been so at one with myself about musical treatment, as I am with regard to this poem," had Wagner written on that day in February when its printed issue was despatched to Liszt, and during this nine-month interregnum we find the subject continually in his mind. March 4: "Write me what you think of my poem; in the summer I shall read it you; if all goes well, there will be some musical sketches already; only I can do nothing worth counting before the middle of May" —through the Zurich concerts; and April 13, "As soon as I can set everything else aside, to plunge head over ears in the well-spring of music again, the thing shall *sound* so that people shall hear what they now cannot see. I shall have much to talk over with you about my *practical* plans for the eventual *performance*." Then to Fischer, June 15: "I shall be composing again soon," though not even a sketch can have been scrawled before Liszt's visit, or his princess would certainly have been informed of it; whereas Wesendonk is told in mid-July that "ruled paper for sketches" is *in readiness*. From this last remark and Liszt's messages of July 17, "When you are working at your Nibelungen, let me be in your thoughts," and 25, "Write away at your Nibelungen," it would seem that Wagner had more than half intended to start work at St Moritz. But nothing can have been done under the lowering conditions of his 'cure' there, and Fischer is told Aug. 23, "Tomorrow I'm off to Italy: I hope the fulfilment of this long-cherished wish may do me good; I need a terrible amount of getting up steam (*Arbeitskraft*) now." In Italy indeed that "prompting" came (157 *ant.*)— which we may interpret as the inspiration with one or more of those leading-motives that were "to well forth of themselves"— and Wagner returns to Zurich "to give up the ghost or compose" (*ibidem*). Still, it can have materialised into no more than a fugitive jotting or two at utmost, for as late as Sept. 29 Liszt

hears, "I have a great desire to get to work at last now [ergo, I have not yet done so]: my customary life is not to be borne at all, unless I eat into myself. Moreover, I cannot possibly keep silent now—although I fully mean to—except I carry out this music at like time. Yet everything came to naught with me after your visit." A week later, we have the bare handful of themes played at the comrades' meeting in Basle; and then comes the trip to Paris.*

What all the 'cures' in the world, all the solitary roamings in North Italy, could not accomplish, was effected by this renewed brush with "life" in the vortex of Paris. Here had the *Flying Dutchman* poem and score been written; here *Tannhäuser* and *Lohengrin* were first conceived; here *Wieland* was drafted; here was the *Meistersinger* text to be penned in years to come; and here was the stimulus at last supplied—be it by Paris itself, by Liszt's society, the hearing of a fine rendering of Beethoven, or what not—for actual composition of the RING DES NIBELUNGEN. It was *rousing* that Wagner had needed, the electric spark that flashes when the circuit is made complete. But contact once made, the current must be shut off. Back to the quiet of his Zurich refuge must the artist fly, to profit by the momentary "vitalising."

November the first of 1853, seemingly three days after his return home, and the day after "the Rhinegold flowed already through his veins," the composition of *Das Rheingold* is begun. A red-letter day, for it is the beginning of a new era in dramatic music. Indeed it is as if the whole art were creating itself afresh, when we hear that E flat of the tuned-down double basses drone

---

* As an error in the late Dr Hueffer's translation of Liszt's letter of Oct. 31 may mislead the English student, I take this opportunity of correcting it. "Your *Rhinegold* is ready, is it not?" would imply that at least the composition-draft stood all but finished when the two friends had said goodbye a fortnight previously, and therefore before Wagner started from Zurich at the beginning of the month—since he could not possibly have worked while on this outing. But the German sentence "Dein Rheingold ist dann fertig, nicht wahr?" should be read in the light of that preceding it, where Liszt speaks of a projected visit to Zurich *next* June. At once we see the significance of that "dann" which Hueffer neglected; for it turns the "ist" into a "will be," a frequent idiom in the German language. So that the sentence ought to be rendered thus: "Your Rheingold will be finished by then, will it not?"—quite an accurate forecast on Liszt's part.

out almost inaudibly from bottomless depths, till it projects from itself its dominant,* and finally its third, and the simple common chord reverberates for a scarcely measurable length of bars, with pulsings wellnigh as measureless. A rhythm imperceptibly appears, such as we gradually decipher from the hum of running waters; tone by tone the major scale evolves through 'passing notes' in the undulating figure,† till one alone is wanting, the sixth of the key. For that one note our ear has been waiting, and no sooner do the curtains part than the scale is completed by it in a series of ascending runs for the wood-wind, the flute gliding up to the high octave and melting into the first sound of a human voice, the water-nymph's F, which at last arrests the 'pedal' E flat, after a reign of 136 bars. With that F, the super-tonic, we are by no means taken from the key, yet it seems raised from its

* After 4 bars of the deep octave it is this harmony of the 'empty' or 'hollow fifth,' prolonged for 12 bars, that we first distinctly hear: a fresh analogy with that earlier path-breaker, the *Flying Dutchman*, whose overture also commences with a few bars compact of nothing but this 'hollow' interval (Holländer-motive) strident at the other end of the scale.

† Herr Albert Heintz has justly pointed out that the semiquaver figure for the celli, appearing at bar 81, "which weak brains have called a 'theft from Mendelssohn's *Melusine* overture,' is a perfectly natural development from the root-theme [horns] and organically *bound* to follow from its first variation at" bar 49 (celli and bassoons). The said resemblance thus is proved to be as purely accidental as it is incidental; but we may go to a greater than Mendelssohn for the "root-theme" itself. In the final movement of Beethoven's op. 110, and at a most impressive juncture, after two whole bars of mysterious insistence on one and the same chord, it is resolved as under:



In the first half of the above we surely have the germ of the *Rheingold* introduction; for Wagner had only just returned from a fortnight of Liszt's companionship, during which time we know that one or two of Beethoven's last sonatas were played to him. That this op. 110 had taken lasting hold of his mind, is shewn by the second half of my quotation, in which, of course, you recognise at once the fugue at the end of *Siegfried*. Nor is that all: your ears will be dull indeed, if you do not trace in the sonata's last page the herdsman's "joyous tune," act iii of *Tristan*, on the one hand, a message from Bach on the other.—Since the above was typed, I learn (300 *inf.*) that the *Siegfried* fugue originally presented itself to Wagner as an outgrowth and replacer of that herdsman's strain.

elementariness to a more sentient life; for the first time we hear a so-called dissonance, albeit a natural ('essential') dissonance, in the shape of a chord of the seventh. And now we realise why that sixth of the scale, the C, had withheld itself so long: it is the fifth to this F, and its frequence in the naïve vocal melody is doubly grateful now. Already we have a minor tint introduced into the music, in the simplest, yet the subtlest way. With Flosshilde's entry, after a recurrence of the tonic triad, the C takes its rightful harmonic place as root of the relative minor triad; but not until this staidest of three lightsome nixies chides her sisters with a needed warning, does an 'accidental' shade the key.

Here is no prelude to a single work of art, but the visible act of generation of a whole new art, an art that shall unfold its every petal with a necessity as of Nature herself. "My musical attitude toward word-verse has immensely altered from of yore"—says the composer next March to Liszt (apropos of L.'s *Künstler*)—"At no price could I set a melody now to verses of Schiller's that were assuredly made for mere reading. With lines like these we can *only* deal according to a certain musical caprice, and where our melody nevertheless will not consent to flow, that caprice impels us to harmonic freaks, stupendous efforts to lend the unmelodic source an artificial undulation.—All this I have experienced in myself, but I have now evolved to adoption of an entirely different mode of fashioning. Thus—imagine it!—the *whole* instrumental introduction to 'Rheingold' is built upon the single triad of E flat."

True, that takes us past the time of so-called 'composition'; but the very first act on November the 1st, 1853, must have been the outlining of this instrumental introduction from which the vast melodic structure gradually evolves. And see! In the Spring of '52, when the *Rheingold* poem lay brooding as yet in its author's brain: "The ballad [you sent] has not pleased me: it is concocted bar by bar, with no clear survey of the whole. These continual harmonic piquancies are becoming quite unbearable to me, and I believe—now that I have my own rhythmic verse at disposal—I shall be able in future to hold myself quite otherwise toward harmony than before. I don't mean that I shall become patriarchally simple; but my harmonies will move in greater breadths, be more palpable and definite in their change" (to Uhlig, March 25, '52). The very key of this

opening is suggested (May 31, '52): "In the third part of *Oper und Drama* I have shewn that harmony first becomes a *real*, not a mere imagined thing, in polyphonic *symphony*, i.e. in the orchestra; consequently that the purely fictive individuality of keys has to be replaced by the real individuality of the instruments, of their manifold colouring, and finally of the declamation. Those who pin their faith to the 'individuality' of keys, pin it to a chimera. It is through the instruments employed, and finally through the human voice *with its word*, that keys, and notes in general, first become characteristic. Thus the characteristic individuality of the key of E major or E flat major, for instance, comes out very prominently on the fiddle or the wind-instrument; and it therefore is half-and-half criticism to consider the key by itself and the instrument not at all, or likewise by itself . . . Whoever in judging my music detaches the harmony from the instrumentation, does me as great an injustice as he who detaches my music from my poem, my song from its words.—But in all such things I have done myself a wrong by announcing my theory too early: I still have to shew in the actual artwork what was ripe in me before my theory."

Here, then, we have the four cardinal points on which the author means to base the music of his RING: vocal melody governed by the rhythm and sense of the verse, simplicity or at least inevitableness of harmony, orchestral polyphony, and choice of instrument according to the mood to be expressed. To seize a detail that irresistibly attracts us, we already have a presage of those horns tuned to E flat that colour all the orchestration till Alberich's appearance necessitates a change of key and scares them back; so that it would not be too much to say that the general idea of this instrumental opening existed in its creator's mind or ever he indited his text. But the chief thing to observe, is his conscious adoption of the maxim of "restraint." To those acquainted with the fulness of Wagner's scores from this date onward, such a claim may appear paradoxical; yet what he professed before his *Rheingold* music was begun, and inculcated while it still was in progress, he vindicates by this example itself a quarter of a century later: "Above all I have to advise the would-be writer of dramatic music not to aim at harmonic and instrumental Effects, but to await a sufficient

cause for every effect of the kind, as otherwise his Effects will not work . . . Never yet have I made the acquaintance of a young composer who did not think to gain my sanction for 'audacities,' before all else [see Appendix]. On the contrary it has been a real astonishment to me, that the restraint [or "caution"—*vorsichtige Anlage*] I have practised with increasing vigilance in the modulating and instrumenting of my works has nowhere met the smallest notice. In the instrumental introduction to 'Rheingold' e.g. it was clean impossible for me to quit the pedal-note, simply because I found no cause to change it; and a great part of the scene that follows for the Rhine-daughters with Alberich would allow of none but the very closest-related keys, since Passion here is still expressed in its most primitive naïvety" (*P.* VI. 184-5).

Through the last reference we are brought to another aspect of the *Rheingold* music, namely the foundation it lays for the "plastic" expression of the whole tetralogy. "After a five-year interruption of my musical productivity," says the author in 1871, "it was with great gladness that I began to carry out the composition of my poem at the decline of the year 1853 to 1854. With 'Rheingold' I was setting my foot on the new path, whereon I had first to find the plastic nature-motives whose more and more individual development was to shape them into bearers of the passions that sway the characters in this widely-ramified plot" (*P.* III. 266). The general principle of these "motives" has already been explained (vol. iii); their special forms have so often been catalogued—notably by Hans von Wolzogen—that I may take some acquaintance therewith for granted, and shall reserve for cap. VIII. an investigation of a couple of them; yet one particular may be adduced in the composer's words, to round this subject off: "I would draw attention to the metamorphoses of the motive wherewith the Rhine-daughters greet the shining gold in childish glee:

"This uncommonly simple theme recurs in the most varied conjunction with almost every other motive of the drama's lengthy

course, and one would have to follow it through all the alterations it receives from the diversity of its re-summoning, to perceive what kind of variation the Drama can evoke in the expression of a theme, while leaving it at all times recognisable . . . Pursue that simple motive through all the changing passions of the whole four-part drama down to Hagen's Watch-song in 'Götterdämmerung'—where it certainly takes on a form that makes it quite inconceivable, at least to me, as theme of a Symphony-movement—and you will find it still governed by the laws of harmony and thematism, only by those laws as applied to Drama. To attempt, however, to apply the results of such an application in turn to the Symphony, would necessarily lead to the latter's utter ruin; for here would present itself as a far-fetched Effect what follows there from a sufficient cause" (*P.* VI. 187-8).* Of such 'motives' the *Rheingold* alone contains some three dozen, all sharp-cut as by a chisel, yet most of them equally susceptible of development.

What was commenced on the 1st of November 1853 is commonly called the "composition-draft" or "sketch" of the *Rheingold* music; but in two important respects it differs from the method of composition adopted in the case of *Lohengrin* and its predecessors (so far as we can gather): it was at the same time less and more complete. Less complete, inasmuch as it was not "entirely worked out," in such a way that any musician could have played it on the pianoforte—as Wagner admits in a letter to Fischer of March '55, where he speaks of the "new method" he had followed; more complete, inasmuch as it already formed a skeleton of the eventual *orchestral* score. In an editorial note to Wagner's letters to Otto Wesendonk, Herr Albert Heintz makes the following remark about this "sketch" and those for *Die Walküre* and the first two acts of *Siegfried* (then in the possession of O. W.'s widow), "Sie sind auf drei Systemen angedeutet, zur späteren Ausführung der Instrumentirung"—a provokingly vague expression, which one can only paraphrase as "They are outlined

* From an article on "Music as applied to Drama" (1879), cited also in the preceding paragraph. This is one of the extremely rare occasions, unfortunately, when the author descends to specific details concerning the music of his riper works.

on three staves as guide for the future orchestration."* Assuming that one of these staves is devoted to the voice part, there would remain a treble and a bass stave for "indications of the instrumenting." How the latter can have even been roughly outlined on two staves, in the first instance, is a mystery; since the orchestra henceforward plays an immensely more significant rôle in Wagner's works than that of mere accompaniment. Those two lower staves must have simply been laden with hieroglyphics, even in this 'composing' stage; for Roeckel is told (Jan. 26, '54) a week or two *before* the 'instrumenting' proper is commenced, "The composition of my so difficult and important Rheingold, now ended, has restored me to great assurance. How much in the whole nature of my poetic aim is first made plain by its music, I have learnt once more: I can't bear the sight of the musicless poem now. In time I hope to be able to let you see the composition also. For the present merely thus much: it has become a firm-knit unity; the orchestra has scarcely a bar that is not developed from preceding motives." Far, far more than a "sketch," then; the whole edifice of orchestration must already have been framed once for all, with the exception of secondary figures and instruments, for Wagner to speak of it thus. The solid framework as of a symphony, not of an opera; but of a symphony from four to five times the length of an average one of Beethoven's; and achieved in but ten weeks, with few, if any, preliminary jottings! As Liszt exclaims (Feb. 21, '54) "Have you really finished it already? That indeed is amazingly quick work!"

If the reader wishes for a glimpse of the composer of *Rheingold* at work, we can partly satisfy his curiosity, thanks, among other things, to letters addressed to Frau Ritter. In his study he had arranged a pair of writing-desks—not for himself and a 'ghost'—but the one for sitting down to pen and ink work, fair-copying, correspondence and so on, the other for standing up at, to compose with the lead-pencil and ruled lines; whilst the famous large divan lay ready for a moment's rest, or quest of some fresh

* It is to be hoped that an expert may some day be given full access to these priceless documents, with authority to reproduce at least a few important passages and make a general report in terms intelligible to the ordinary musical amateur. Meanwhile I have to observe that the German use of the word "System," in musical terminology, is at antagonism with that current in England.

'motive.'* "In the lap of this luxury I deposit myself of a forenoon, and work; a morning without work is a day in hell." His modus operandi will partly explain the need for that high desk. Standing, not only could he feel himself more in the position of a conductor controlling his orchestra, and more easily realise the gestures that would to some extent affect the sounds emitted by his acting characters—"So abominably practical have I now become, that the moment of representation always darts into my mind at once" (March '54)—but it left him free to pace his study, as was his wont, while mentally working out a scene or passage. When occasion arose, these perambulations were extended to the adjoining room (you will remember the door-less doorways), where stood the pianoforte, to try the concrete effect of some phrase or chord; but, as Mr Finck most justly observes (*Wagner and his Works* II. 27), "The very idea that those amazingly complex orchestral scores—which it is almost impossible to reduce to pianistic terms—could have been composed at the piano, is ridiculous: Wagner *could not even play them on the piano*, and had to get his friends—Liszt, Klindworth, Bülow and Tausig—to do it for him. The whole atmosphere of his mind was orchestral"—to which we may add, and vocal. *Sing* his dramas he could, and did, whole acts of them; not play them satisfactorily—most certainly not from his own drafts, since that letter to Fischer of March '55 expressly states his need of someone to make "a pianoforte arrangement to enable me to play a thing or two from Rheingold to my friends."

Had he been a musician who composed at the piano, as has

---

* That his musical motives mostly came to him when his body, or at least his eye was resting (cf. that "sleepless night" at Spezzia, 157 *ant.*), may be argued from his observations on the process in 1879: "Let the *dramatic* composer look squarely in the face of the one character, for instance, with which he is the most concerned this very day . . . then let him set it in a twilight where he can see but the glance of its eye: if that speak to him, the shape itself maybe will now begin to move, and that perhaps will scare him—but he must not mind; at last its lips will part, and a ghostly voice breathe something so real, so altogether seizable, and yet so never-heard—that it wakes him from his dream. Everything has vanished; but in his mental ear it still rings on: he has had an 'inspiration,' and it is a so-called musical 'motive.' God knows if others have also heard the same, or something similar before? . . It is *his* motive, quite legally delivered to and settled on him by that eerie shape in that moment of strange detachment" (*P.* VI. 170).

been foolishly suggested, how is it that, with exception of some half-a-dozen pieces for the 'albums' of friends and admirers—pieces which themselves suggest composition *away* from the piano*—never since his earliest youth did he write for that instrument? What Praeger has to say to the contrary is credible only by those who will believe *anything* they see in print, for he contradicts himself within half a page: "Wagner composed *at* the piano, in an elegantly well arranged study. With him composing was a work of excitement and much labour. . . . He laboured excessively. Not to find or make up a phrase; no, he did not seek his ideas at the piano. He went to the piano with his idea already composed, and made the piano his sketch-book, wherein he worked and reworked his subject, steadily modelling his matter until it assumed the shape he had in his mind." Contradiction within half a page, did I say? Here it occurs within one sentence: if the idea was "already composed" before he went to the piano, it *had already* "assumed the shape he had in his mind," unless we are to suppose that Wagner did not even know how to transfer his musical thoughts to paper without the aid of an instrument he more or less despised—which is absurd. To talk of the piano as being Wagner's "sketch-book" is unadulterated nonsense, and so soon as Praeger indulges in an instance, a solitary instance, the poor man gives two flatly contradictory accounts of it in his English book and the German edition thereof "translated by the author."† After

* Witness the ineffective register selected for first statement of the principal subject in the pfte piece directly preceding *Das Rheingold*, the "Album-sonata": imagine this transferred to a cello, and you will guess how it must have been conceived. See also Appendix.

† Page 295 of *Wagner as I knew him:* "I had one morning retired to my room [July '57] for the Schopenhauer study, when the piano was pounded more vigorously than usual. The incessant repetition of one theme arrested my attention. Schopenhauer was discarded. I came down stairs. The theme was being played with another rhythm. I entered the room . . . and inquired as to the change of rhythm. The explanation astonished me. Wagner was engaged on a portion of 'Siegfried,' the scene where Mime tells Siegfried of his murderous intentions whilst under the magic influence of the tarn helm. 'But how did you come to change the rhythm?' 'Oh,' he said, 'I tried and tried, thought and thought, until I got just what I wanted.' And that it was perseverance with him, and not spontaneity, is borne out by another incident." The other "incident" having absolutely *no* bearing on the point —"He was improvising, when, in the midst of a flowing movement, he

that, we may blandly smile at his conclusion that "it was perseverance with him [W.], and not spontaneity." Not *spontaneity*, forsooth, with a man who could compose the music of *Rheingold* in ten weeks? "Laboured excessively," and "a work of much labour," when Wagner is eternally dilating on the pleasure he experiences in the act of composing! We shall have a different tale, from that of this puzzle-head, to hear in a minute.

During these mornings devoted to composition nobody durst disturb him. Unfortunately for Minna, he often prolonged them past the regulation meal-time, as he writes Frau Ritter: "When composing I generally undertake too much, and drive my wife to justifiable wrath by keeping dinner waiting; so that it is in the sweetest of humours I enter the second half of the day, with which I don't at all know what to do: solitary walks in the mist;

---

suddenly stopped, unable to finish"—we will pass to the German version, page 315 of *Wagner wie ich ihn kannte:* "One day I had been reading long, and it was already near the midday meal-time, when I was so attracted by the repetition of a few phrases that sounded up from Wagner's study, that I laid Schopenhauer aside, and went down to see Wagner in his study and ask him about these curious rhythmic changes . . . 'How did you come all at once to another rhythm?' I asked him, and sang the passage—it was in 'Siegfried,' in the scene where Mime, under the influence of the tarnhelm, declares his murderous intent 'dem Kinde den Kopf abzuhauen.' When he told me, and I praised the wonderful effect, he said quite unassumingly, 'These are things that occur to me quite unexpectedly, and the fitness of which I only discover later.' I begged him to write down the passage for me, which he did at once." There can be no mistake about the particular passage, then; it is that where the rhythm of Mime's old "zullendes Kind" song is changed from 6/8 to 4/4 for one bar, at the words "Kopf abhau'n," with a most comical effect, chiefly due to the staccato. Poor Praeger, unacquainted with act i, imagined that Wagner was hammering out a *new* theme on the piano, and at last had found its definite form; whereas the composer—at the *end* of his morning's work, mind you—was manifestly playing over to himself a whole scene he had just written, a scene containing many "repetitions" of that and other motives. Upon this misconstrued episode does Praeger base his theory! So reckless is he, that he invents two mutually destructive explanations to put into Wagner's mouth, just because he himself has not the wit to perceive how natural was a *rallentando* here. And such is the authority, accepted even by some who should know better, for the statement that "Wagner composed at the piano." Why not go a little farther, and take Praeger's word for it—he really is consistent here, you know—that Mime was "under the magic influence of the tarn helm"? The whole thing is too grotesque.

sundry evenings at Wesendonck's [Hôtel Baur]. It is there I still obtain my only stimulation; the graceful lady remains true and attached to me, though there also is much in this society that can but torture me." Merely suggesting that the last clause may either connect Herr Otto with the remark to Liszt about heads shaken at the writer's expenditure (p. 175 *ant.*), or Frau Mathilde with those as yet unable to follow his ideas, we may cap its predecessor with a reminiscence by the lady herself:* "What Wagner had composed in the morning, he used to try on my grand in the afternoon. It was the hour between 5 and 6, and he gave himself the title of 'the twilight-man' (*Dämmermann*). If he entered the room visibly tired and exhausted, it was beautiful to see how his face lost its clouds after a little rest and refreshment, and his features lit up when he sat down to the piano. At times it would happen, however, that something did not satisfy him, and he sought for another expression. Such was the case with the building of the Walhall-motive. I said, 'Master, that is good!' 'No, no,' he replied, 'it must become still better.' For a while he strode impatiently up and down the salon, then ran away. The following afternoon he did not appear, nor the second and third day after. At last he steals quietly in, sits down to the piano, and plays the glorious motive precisely as before. 'Well?'—I ask. 'Eh! eh! You were right. I can't improve it.'" Reminiscence against reminiscence, this of Frau Wesendonk's—simply told as it is, without the shadow of an axe to grind—is more convincing than that of Praeger's. Unwittingly the lady shews exactly what part the pianoforte played in Wagner's method of composing: he merely used it as a block on which to try the sound of something already created; if a theme did not quite content him then, he would recogitate it in his head while pacing up and down the room; but the result would mostly be that his first inspiration was the one he finally adopted, perhaps after convincing himself that his dissatisfaction had arisen from the impossibility of realising his idea to the full on so colourless and unsustaining an instrument.

Ten weeks, I said, was all the time the *Rheingold* composition

* *Allg. Musikzeitung* Feb. 1896; see 131 *ant.*

took. That, however, is an extreme limit: if we reckon various interruptions, the net duration is reduced to about *seven* weeks of mornings, no longer than that of the *Holländer* music twelve years ago! "The peculiar nature-freshness that breathed upon me from my work, as if in the air of high mountains, bore me unfatigued over every exertion" (*P.* III. 266).

The first interruption was voluntary, at the end of a fortnight; by which time we may suppose the beautiful first scene to have been completed and the Walhall-motive to have evolved from the motive of the Ring. "I feel so hale and happy with my present work, that I may anticipate not only success to the music itself, but also my own convalescence, if only I can abandon myself to this splendid mood without disturbance. Had I to get up one morning with a veto set on working at my music, I should be miserable. To-day I interrupt it for the first time, to cure myself once for all, if possible, of this fear that haunts me like a spectre" (to Liszt, Nov. 16, '53). This fear was nothing superstitious, like the former dread lest death might overtake him ere he had finished the scoring of *Tannhäuser*, the versifying of *Die Walküre*. Care had been gnawing at his entrails some weeks before the composition of *Das Rheingold*, though such was Wagner's power of artistic detachment that he could say just after its completion, "During this work I often felt quite well; the storm-clouds seemed to have wholly cleared. Often I had a beautiful sense of being lifted up and softly carried: for the most part I was silent from an inner gladness—even Hope caressed my heart" (to L. Jan. '54).

The pause he now makes, is for the purpose of rooting up that care: "My threat, that I might have unblushingly to call you in once more, must be fulfilled to-day"—his extremely long letter of Nov. 16 begins, thus pointing to some hint conveyed to Liszt during the expedition of a month ago, and confirming Liszt's own fears of last July (cap. IV.). "I must put my money-matters straight, not to be harassed by them any longer . . . The peculiar character of my theatrical receipts places me in a constant state of agitation, which has at last become most painful. Although it is pretty certain now, that my two latest operas will end by being given on every stage in Germany, as Tannhäuser already is on most of them, yet the *time* when they will be asked and paid for is something so indeterminable that—mainly dependent as I am on these receipts—I become fatally unsettled; and the worst of it

is, my sanguine temperament always strikes the balance in such a way that I over-rate my instant prospects and expend a deal more than is really coming to me.* With my reprehensible inclination to a somewhat more comfortable kind of life than I had led these latter years, this tantalising haphazardness of my theatre-fees has brought me to the position of having to meet heavy bills at Christmas without a single fee to count upon for certain. But even were that not so acute a case, this eternal tension regarding what may turn up, this daily waiting for the postman—to bring me in an order, an assent—is so utterly odious and unworthily distracting, particularly *now*, that I must think of a radical cure."

No: he is not asking Liszt to foot his bills; merely to act as intermediary with the Härtels. *Tannhäuser* has already been sold to two-and-twenty German theatres—we learn from this letter—and it is as good as certain that fifteen others will follow suit, not including the big Court-theatres in Berlin, Vienna and Munich. The total receipts, past and future, from those seven-and-thirty theatres Wagner figures at 632 louis d'or, or a little over £500; from which we may deduce, in passing, that the perpetual performing-rights of *Tannhäuser* have so far brought him in, from two-and-twenty theatres, about the noble sum of £300 in the last two years or so.† He further reckons, correctly if a little prematurely, that *Lohengrin* will also make the round of every theatre, "and maintain itself in the public's favour even more firmly than Tannhäuser; which has already set several directors completely

---

* Cf. March 9, '53, to F. Heine: "I shall probably remain a noodle in finance to the end of my days."

† It has already been shewn (vol. ii, 389) that he had made over the whole of his other rights in *Tannhäuser* to his publication-creditors—the deed, in fact, had been executed just before his recent trip to Basle and Paris—so that the phenomenal sale of 6000 textbooks at Breslau alone in one winter (mentioned in this letter) brought no pecuniary profit to himself. In confirmation of the rapid growth of popularity, I may cite the *Neue Zeitschrift* of Nov. 18 ('53): "A Breslau paper lately reported: After a few months' pause [summer vacation] Richard Wagner's 'Tannhäuser' was yesterday performed again at our theatre, for the benefit of Herr Erl. In the meantime this music, which some people are so fond of taxing with heaviness, unintelligibleness and eccentricity, has become popular with *us* at least. Wherever a handful of musicians play to us here, a piece from Tannhäuser appears in their pro-

on their legs again." On the strength of these arguments he tenders a business proposal to Härtels: nothing has he had from them for the score of *Lohengrin* beyond the liquidation of a trifling ancient debt, a half-promise of consideration later on, and a prospective half-share in the proceeds of the text-books; now, subject to a few reservations, he offers them his whole remaining rights in that opera, together with a certain number of vocal and pianoforte arrangements from it, for the inclusive sum of 15,000 francs (£600) to be paid him on the 20th of December. His reservations are the performing-rights for the three Court-theatres aforesaid, for London and Paris, and for the four theatres with which he has already contracted, namely Weimar, Dresden, Wiesbaden and Leipzig. Even excluding those larger establishments, the figure looks ludicrously small in light of the enormous popularity subsequently attained by *Lohengrin* in Germany, notwithstanding that Wagner declares his intention to ask each theatre from 25 to 50 per cent more for this work than for its predecessor; yet in these early days it would have been a reasonably fair bargain on both sides. In the long run, no doubt, it would be better for him to keep his performing-rights in his own pocket; but, apart from his immediate need of an unspecified portion of the sum, "How I wish that this or something like it could be brought about, so that I might set my mind at ease for the next two or three years—years of work so important to me—and at least keep them unalloyed by any sordid worries! Reflect, dearest friend, that I'm offering no slop for sale; that I have *no* further expectation of takings, beyond *this* opera and Tannhäuser [the *Dutchman*

---

gramme, and vociferous applause rewards the most mediocre performance. In every concert during the past season, by every musical society, something from the said composition was brought to hearing, and each time the audience has manifested its pleasure in so enthusiastic a fashion that the whisperings of a few theorists and the head-shakings of sundry 'professionals' vanish into nothing. The popularity attained by Wagner's music here is an indisputable triumph"; and so on, with a long defence of the composer's disregard of theoretic 'rules,' ending: "Wherever this music is offered us, it draws us there again. What wonder if yesterday's performance of Tannhäuser had so large an audience again as we have not seen this year since Roger's visit?" A fortnight later we read (Dec. 2): "Wagner's Tannhäuser has recently been produced at Cologne and Königsberg [Nov. 18], at both places with the greatest success."

and *Rienzi?*], since I would not sully the Nibelungen with the smallest Jewish calculation even in thought, and fain would keep it quite pure for myself in this regard as well—and you will back me up with Härtels. . . . Pah! this bartering!!!! An evil, musicless day! And it's drab and foggy out-of-doors too. Let's hope tomorrow will be better!!"

If the reader resents being torn from the composition of *Das Rheingold* to the jingle of pounds, shillings and pence, he cannot resent it more keenly than did the author, by whom "much money will be needed, if I am to stay on in my nest"; I cannot spare him, however, if he desires a picture of the circumstances midst which the music of the RING DES NIBELUNGEN began—alas! midst which the greater part of it was finished.

As Liszt had to go to Leipzig for Berlioz' concert of December 1, he took the opportunity to sound the Härtels and lay his friend's letter before them: "I have known them for many years, and always found them most respectable and *comme il faut;* so that I flattered myself they would meet your wish to some extent. Unfortunately, such is not the case—and I am in the disagreeable position of having to convey you a refusal," he writes Dec. 13, having just returned from Berlioz' second Leipzig concert, of the 11th, only to find Dr Härtel's dispiriting answer awaiting him at home. He describes the firm as belonging to the "party of moderate progress" and looking askance at "your and my friends Pohl, Ritter, Brendel and so on"; and worst of all, "they are directly influenced by several partisans of the so-called Historic school. In particular, Jahn is a great friend of Dr Härtel's." It may or may not have been the advice of Otto Jahn, that deterred the worthy Härtels from what would in any case appear to them a risky venture; but the celebrated biographer of Mozart openly shewed his hand not long hereafter by two slashing attacks on *Tannhäuser* and *Lohengrin* (reprinted in his *Gesammelte Aufsätze über Musik* 1866).

A quite subsidiary part of Wagner's offer was accepted by the Härtels, nevertheless, about a month hence; those vocal arrangements from *Lohengrin*. In his long November letter he had said to Liszt: "We know that, with operas, the so-called *morceaux détachés* form the main source of a publisher's profit. Now, in the case of *Lohengrin* such pieces cannot be issued *at all*, because of its peculiarity in having no separable vocal numbers. Only

I, the work's composer, could manage to extract a number of the most attractive vocal pieces; expressly rearranging them, providing them with beginning and end, and so on.—*Nine* such pieces, short, easy, even popular, I recently handed you, begging you to transmit them to Messrs Härtel whenever I should send you word: they can appear as arranged *by myself*. Further, I indicated five pieces to Bülow of the same sort of cut as the vocal ones—only longer—which he might arrange as independent melodious pieces for the pianoforte, and thus counteract the ill effect of those pianoforte scores without words, in the preparation of which I was never consulted." Here we plainly see what had occupied Wagner in the second half of last September, between his return from Italy and his setting out for Basle: he had *not* been sketching themes for *Rheingold*, but picking out plums from its predecessor to help sustain him while at work.* And this accessory labour does in fact bring some material reward; at the turn of the year he is paid by Breitkopf and Härtel 300 thalers (£45) for his "nine detached vocal pieces"—handsome enough, as things go, but not a twelfth of his estimated needs, if he is to pursue his work in peace.

After despatching that lengthy proposal on the 16th of November '53, it is possible that Wagner resumed the composition of

---

* That *this* was the task on which he was engaged just before the general rendezvous at Basle, is confirmed by a remark in Bülow's letter of Oct. 12 to his mother, immediately after that meeting, "Wagner has commissioned me with Lohengrin and Tannhäuser arrangements, which do not brook much delay." The fate of Hans' pfte arrangements is of interest, in illustration of the difficulties besetting *Lohengrin* at every turn; but I must relegate that subject to the Appendix. The vocal pieces extracted by Wagner himself were published by Breitkopf und Härtel in 1854 under the title "Lyrische Stücke für eine Gesangsstimme aus Lohengrin von Richard Wagner. Ausgezogen und eingerichtet vom Componisten." Numbers 1 to 4 are headed "*Für eine Frauenstimme* (*Sopran*)," and consist of 1) "Elsa's Traum"; 2) "Elsa's Gesang an die Lüfte"; 3) "Elsa's Ermahnung an Ortrud"; 4) "Brautlied" (a solo!). Then come four "*Für eine hohe Männerstimme* (*Tenor*)": 5) "Lohengrin's Verweis an Elsa" (*Athmest du nicht*); 6) "Lohengrin's Ermahnung an Elsa" (*Höchstes Vertrau'n*); 7) "Lohengrin's Herkunft"; 8) "Lohengrin beim Abschied." Finally, number 9 is "*Für eine tiefe Männerstimme* (*Bariton*)," "König Heinrich's Aufruf" (*Habt Dank, ihr Lieben von Brabant*). It will be noticed that only one number is taken from act i; two come from act ii; the remaining six from act iii.

46

Rheingold next day. But it can only have been for a day or two, as his next letter to Liszt, Dec. 17, speaks of "a violent feverish cold last month" that had made him "incapable of work for ten days." At the end of that illness we find him conducting Beethoven's C minor Symphony at the Zurich 'Panharmonic' Nov. 29; which in itself, with rehearsals, would entail an arrest of creation for two or three days. So that the latter half of November would witness but little, if any, progress in the work. Here we may accordingly fit in Frau Wesendonk's tale of the Walhall motive and Wagner's temporary disappearance (187 *ant.*). When he made his first pause, he had probably arrived at that ethereal passage where the violins, the flutes and harps, successively take up the theme of "Nature's weaving" with such exquisite effect, as the mists melt away and Walhall is at last revealed in all the richness of the softened 'brass.' It would be the psychologic moment for a suspension of work; and the unexpected prolongation of the pause, with the consequent necessity of wooing his muse afresh, may account for a slight flagging in the opening dialogue of the second scene, where Fricka in particular scarce quits the bounds of conventional Recitative before her words "Um des Gatten Treue besorgt." But the tide of inspiration soon flowed full again, and with the entry of Froh we reach another burst of splendour.

To enumerate the beauties of such a work of music, or to point out the various places where the earlier manner may still be traced, is hardly a task for the lay chronicler; yet it should be remarked that those marvellous themes connected with Freia, with the spear-runes, the Nibelungs' hammering, and above all with Loge (not to mention the *cantabile* on "Weibes Wonne und Werth")—themes that play so important a rôle throughout the whole remainder of the trilogy—were all fashioned during this first fortnight of December 1853, when Wagner was still upon tenterhooks as to the answer Liszt would transmit him from Härtels concerning the *Lohengrin* offer. With "heavy bills to meet at Christmas," and dismal uncertainty as to his material future, his brain could yet devise the most distinctive of all his musical imaginings, the flickering, scintillating motives of his Fire-god.

Toward the end of this scene—shall we say with the exit of the Giants?—came a second interruption, of two to three days, for a 'Panharmonic' concert on December 13, at which Wagner

conducted Haydn's D (C?) minor Symphony and Beethoven's *Egmont* music. Soon after resuming work, and completing that scene, he receives Liszt's evil tidings and snatches an instant from his precious morning work-time to reply (Dec. 17): "I'm quite angry with myself for having burdened you long-suffering friend with the Härtel business too. Forgive me! There's an end of it, and—please God—you shall hear no more of such Jewish trade. I'm in a fatal fix for the moment, it's true: but—that mustn't trouble *you* . . . I'm spinning myself in, like a silkworm [a topical allusion—see iii, 275]; but I'm also spinning something out of myself. For five years I had written no music. Now I'm in 'Nibelheim': to-day *Mime* gave voice to his woes. Had it not been for the feverish cold that seized me last month, and made me incapable of work for 10 days, I should have been certain to complete the draft this year. Moreover, my somewhat shaky situation often robs me of the humour: for the nonce I am badly becalmed. Still, I must finish by the end of January." The reader must be left to detect for himself any signs of "becalming" in the region round about Mime's complaint, but should note that this strenuous application has begun to tell on the composer's health, for he proceeds: "I had so much I wanted to tell you; yet my head is burning already! All is not right with me: again and again the thought strikes me like lightning, that it really were better I died! However, that has nothing to do with my music-writing"—in other words, he forgets all about it when at work, and does not realise that the eyestrain of so much "Notenschreiben" (think of those eternal ruled parallel lines!) is largely responsible for the "burning head."

About a week later, say with the end of the scene in Nibelheim, must have come another pause of two or three days; for Wagner has to conduct Beethoven's Fourth Symphony and the Friedensmarsch from *Rienzi* at the Panharmonic on December 27.* But he is so engrossed with his work that—saving a dozen affectionate lines of thanks for a Christmas present, Liszt's medallion—not another word do we hear from him personally till Jan. 13, 1854, concludes a business letter to Schindelmeisser with "Tomorrow

* To the reminiscence-hunter I might suggest a comparison of the *Rheingold* music with the pieces conducted at these three concerts that interrupted its composition. Possibly his ingenuity may find an echo, but he must not blame me if it doesn't, as I have not tried.

I shall finish the composition of the first of my Nibelungen pieces, das Rheingold." Nor does "tomorrow" fail him, for he begins a letter of Jan. 15 to Liszt with "Das *Rheingold* is done— : but *I*, too, am done for ! ! !—Latterly I smothered myself in my work so deliberately that I even suppressed every call to write to yourself ere its completion.* To-day is the first morning no pretext withholds me from letting loose the lamentation I long have kept chained up. Let it break loose !—I can check it no longer."

On the 14th of January 1854, then, was finished the draft of the *Rheingold* music ; just ten weeks from its inception, and a twelvemonth from the last touch put to the poem of the whole tetralogy. And this 'composition-draft' was no mere tentative rough sketch, but already a "firm-knit unity" (p. 183 *ant.*). "*Rheingold* is finished"—we read, farther on in the letter of the 15th to Liszt—"more finished than I had thought. With what faith, what joy, I went to this music ! In a veritable fury of despair have I pursued it to its end : ah ! how the Gold has spun its toils round me as well ! Believe me, never was composing done like this : my music, methinks, is terrific ; 'tis a welter of horrors and heights !—I shall be making the fair copy soon (? ?) :—black on white ; and that perhaps will be an end of it. Or am I to let this also be performed for 20 louis d'or at Leipzig ? "

Yes : the late accumulating worries had been brought to a head by something that occurred at Leipzig ; and the last pages of the *Rheingold* music—conceive it ! that wonderful peroration, from Donner's gathering of the storm-clouds to the rainbow-transit into Walhall—must have been written under conditions that needed the fullest exercise of will-power, the most entire abandonment to inspiration, to keep the composer at his desk.

January 7, 1854, Leipzig very nearly throttled *Lohengrin ;* with consequences swift and dire.

Last volume we saw how *Tannhäuser* had dragged through

---

* Cf. his letter to F. Heine of Jan. 19 : "Of late I have written to next to nobody, I was so up to my ears in composing. Since I got back from Paris —beginning of November—I have set the 'Rheingold' to music ; so enthusiastic was I with it, that I had neither eyes nor ears for anything before its end."

month after month of chicanery ere the Leipzig theatre produced it on the last day of January 1853. Just before that production, however, the good townsfolk were given a foretaste of *Lohengrin* itself, thus reported in the *Neue Zeitschrift* (Jan. 28, '53) :—

"For the Benefit of the orchestral pension-fund, which took place on the 17th January in the hall of the Gewandhaus, the Introduction and third scene from the first act of Lohengrin were chosen. This is the first work of Wagner's to come to a hearing here since a number of years, and particularly since the revulsion of public opinion in his regard. Expectation was strained to the utmost, but even at the rehearsal (which we did not attend ourselves) the success with the very numerous assembly of listeners was so emphatic, that it was there and then decided to repeat this fragment at the subscription-concert of four days later. The same result we witnessed at both the public performances, intensified indeed at the repetition Jan. 20. We have spoken with nobody who was not touched to the quick by the grandeur and sublimity of this art, even the few who had refused to be convinced before. Thus the Wagnerian principle has provisionally gained a complete victory here, and a natural consequence is, that all who take an interest in music are looking eagerly forward to the coming first representation of Tannhäuser. Even the criticisms in the Leipzig daily press have been well-disposed ; merely the reporter of the Tageblatt talked some nonsense at first, but made haste to eat his words after the second performance."

Presumably Rietz was conductor on both these occasions, and we therefore must give him the credit of at least a respectable rendering, though the *N. Z.* does speak of the brass-players "blowing to their hearts' content." Yet it would be interesting to know *who* prompted the selection, as Wagner certainly had no friends on the Gewandhaus committee. In all probability it was the bandsmen themselves, for they would naturally have a voice in the framing of a programme for their own benefit-concert.*

* A supposition strengthened by the fact that at the concert in aid of the Orchestral Pension-fund on March 15, 1855, the *Dutchman* overture was given, and at a similar concert on the 8th November, also '55, the *Faust* overture. The remarks of the *Mus. World* regarding the work last-named I reserve for a future chapter, but will quote as a curiosity its Leipzig correspondent's comment on the *Dutchman* overture: "For the first time Herr Wagner's music has been heard within the Gewandhaus walls, and, to judge from the coolness of its reception, it will also be the last. At the conclusion, not one hand was raised to applaud the 'Music of the Future.' If it

Be that as it may, *Tannhäuser* soon proved so good an investment to the lessee of the theatre in this stronghold of musical conservatism, that he determined to mount *Lohengrin* also, for pure love of the—profits. So we find Wagner writing Liszt from St Moritz early in August '53: "I suppose you have had an invitation from Leipzig by now?—Wirsing had written me about Lohengrin: for my part, I answered to Raymund Härtel, begging him to take this matter in hand and acquaint Wirsing with my '*conditio sine qua non.*' I had a good memory for your friendly promise, you see, and have taken sinful advantage of it." What that *conditio sine qua non* was, we learn the most explicitly from a letter to F. Heine (Jan. 19, '54): "I consented to the Leipzig production solely on condition that Liszt should take my place there—if not as conductor—yet as supervisor (*Überwacher*) of the whole production: he was even to have the right to veto it, if he found that no favourable result was to be expected."

Aug. 16, '53, Wagner again writes Liszt: "Well, have you had any overtures from Leipzig regarding Lohengrin? Härtels have kept me waiting a long time for an answer. It's to be hoped I now shall soon hear how things stand." About the same time Liszt (letter 122), "When I go to Leipzig, I will attend to the Lohengrin affair. Down to the present I have been told nothing about it." Then Wagner records another move on the chessboard, Aug. 25: "Härtels sent me Wirsing's louis-d'ors the other day, but without a word as to whether you had been asked to take the supreme direction (*Oberleitung*) of Lohengrin at Leipzig, or that you had accepted such an offer. I hope to hear more about it from yourself soon." Here we have evidence of sharp practice on Director Wirsing's part at least, much on a par with the *Tannhäuser* shufflings of a year ago, but more artfully contrived. By sending the fee *without* entering into the conditions, he committed himself in black and white to nothing, and could

---

was admired at all, it was in profound silence" (*M. W.* March 24, '55). That the *M. W.* was misinformed as to this being the *first* admission of Wagner's music within those sacred walls, is shewn by my record above (to say nothing of Mendelssohn's slaughter of the *Tannh.*-ov. in '46); yet its evidence supplies another link in the chain of proof that the Leipzig clique was determined to suppress that music, so far as lay in its power. The more honour to the humble members of the orchestra, those "bandsmen" whose true-heartedness and right instinct Wagner is never tired of praising.

wriggle out of the proviso at will. The moment also was well chosen, for Wagner received the money on the eve of his Italian journey. His best course would undoubtedly have been to return the fee to Härtels, to be held in escrow till his stipulations were positively agreed to ; but it may easily be imagined that the money came in very handy, and he would flatter himself that the silence of the other party must legally mean consent.

On his return from Italy he begins to grow alarmed, for he writes Liszt Sept. 12, "How ever are things going with Leipzig? I can learn nothing definite from there !—What a time it is since I heard anything from *yourself!!*" Quite plainly, the Leipzig people did not intend that he *should* learn anything definite until too late, and it is equally manifest that they never invited Liszt at all; for Liszt goes to Leipzig himself Sept. 15-16, and writes his friend on the 20th (from Carlsruhe), "I must tell you by word of mouth [at Basle] about the Leipzig business. I have arranged with Rietz in this way: that I shall be present at the last rehearsals and the first representation of Lohengrin, and will make you a minute report on it." A very different arrangement to Wagner's *conditio sine qua non*, concerning which he afterwards tells Heine (*loc. cit.*) that "Rietz downright set his back against it,* and the thing had already come to a rupture when Härtels effected a discreet compromise through *Liszt's* compliance, according to which Liszt was just to look in at the general rehearsals and perhaps give Rietz a friendly hint or two." From one point of view, that of personal prestige, we can understand Rietz' objection to being placed under superior orders in his own citadel; but the case was exceptional—an admittedly new and difficult style of work, which Liszt had been the first to introduce to the public, and for the rendering whereof he possessed the author's own minute instructions. On the other hand, nothing could *force* Rietz to consent to quasi-supersession, and it would therefore have been far wiser for Liszt to wash his hands of the whole affair at once, and let the "rupture" be complete ; for—what if the full

* It was not Wagner alone, that Rietz opposed. Very similar treatment was meted out to Schumann :—Feb. '49 he writes Rietz, expressing his disappointment that the rehearsals of *Genoveva*, for which he was on the eve of starting from Dresden, have been postponed ; Rietz leaves him unanswered till May, and the première does not come off till June 25 of the *following* year (1850)—see *Die Musik* Oct. 1903, p. 18.

rehearsals were to be so artfully planned that it would be *impossible* for him to attend? That we shall see. Meanwhile the continuation of Liszt's letter of Sept. 20 shews him far too unobservant to have made a really good ambassador: "When I got to Leipzig there was all manner of gossip afoot concerning the Lohengrin production; presumably all that is silenced now, and you will hear nothing more of it.—The opera is to be produced in course of November, and in my opinion a very warm reception of your work is to be expected of the public. The Leipzig fort has decidedly been captured for your name and cause, and even the 'Wohlbekannte' told me how tears came to his eyes when he heard the Lohengrin finale [last Jan.]. Let things go on thus, and Leipzig quite certainly will 'lohengrinise' soon!—The contingent delay in the production will do no manner of harm: *au contraire;* and as far as that goes, even the town-gossip aforesaid has not been detrimental. I will tell you all about it when we meet."

The Basle meeting (cap. IV), when the subject was of course threshed out between Liszt and Wagner, thus robs us of further details of a most disastrous compromise. The next we hear is Dec. 13, from Liszt: "Tomorrow week, the 21st, is the date for Lohengrin in Leipzig. Conjecturably, however, the first performance will be deferred till the 26th. In any case I shall go there for the last two full rehearsals and the first performance, and will give you an exact account.—Rietz is said to be very diligently rehearsing the separate components of the band, wood, brass and strings.—Altogether, the event is being very favourably prepared-for in Leipzig, so that a decisive and lasting success of your work may be taken for granted." *Couleur de rose.* As Liszt had that morning returned from a two days' stay in Leipzig, we may consider him stuffed—stuffed is the word—with the latest information; yet those "very diligent" practisings can have barely commenced, for on the day after production (nearly four weeks from this visit of Liszt's) Pohl tells the *N. Z.* that there had been no more than *seven* orchestral rehearsals in from three to four weeks!

Had Rietz and Co. so desired, they might have profited by Liszt's presence on the 12th (Berlioz' second concert falling on the 11th). But no: they did their utmost to elude him. A fortnight thence Liszt has the pitiable tale to unfold: "Thursday, 29 Dec. '53. Weimar—just back from Leipzig, after waiting in vain there yesterday and the day before for Lohengrin.—Seemingly,

the representation will come off in a few days; so far, it cannot be fixed, as first the Elsa is ill, then the King or Telramund, and the bass-clarinet ordered from Erfurt has not been received—and when it does turn up, nobody knows if the Leipzig clarinetist will be able to play it, etc., etc., etc.—David and Pohl had advised me on Monday evening that the full rehearsal would take place on Tuesday. I had to conduct Tannhäuser here on Monday the 26th. . . . Well, at 3 A.M. on Tuesday, with more than 20 degrees of frost, I started by rail with Cornelius, to reach Leipzig in time for the Lohengrin rehearsal (half past 8 in the morning).—I sent at once to David, who returned word that the rehearsal was not taking place, owing to the illness of Herr Schott (König Heinrich). —Presently David called, and consoled me with the hope of next day.—Yesterday we telegraphed for the Mildes to come, as Brassin and the Meyer had also fallen ill; but Zigesar would not allow them to go to Leipzig, as the *Holländer* is announced here for New Year's day.—Finally I was informed this morning, from a reliable quarter, that Lohengrin will not be produced at Leipzig for a few days yet.—So soon as anything can be settled, I am to be telegraphed to—and if I can make it at all possible, I shall go to Leipzig again, to render you my report on the performance."

By Liszt's own account, then, his 'diplomacy' has been thoroughly out-manœuvred; his right of veto already yielded up, the most heroic exertions have simply ended in his being hoodwinked for his pains. Singers' 'indispositions,' like Charity, are the recognised expedient for covering a multitude of sins; but, whether real or assumed in this instance, the inconvenient fact remains that the leader of the orchestra had suddenly summoned the "supervisor" for a day and hour on which it was morally impossible for him to attend: as he *did* arrive in time, another ruse was needed. Most significant of all: not a word is breathed about Rietz. Much use would Liszt's presence at a rehearsal have been, when the conductor could not even treat him with common civility! *

* A pendant to the above is furnished in a letter of Anton Rubinstein's to Liszt dated Leipzig Oct. 6, '54: "Nothing pleases me here, and I find the persons of an insupportable arrogance, the things of an unpardonable badness.—Your letter to David procured me the sacramental phrase, 'Rest assured that everything I can do for you' etc., etc. As for my visit to Rietz, Schleinitz etc., inquisitorial and mistrustful looks; they required me to hand my *Ocean*

Having given Liszt the slip for the nonce, and thoroughly wearied him, into the bargain, the next thing was to hurry up the production before he could possibly find time to make another descent. Bass-clarinet, King, Telramund and Elsa, all suddenly fall into line ; and Liszt, tricked out of the last chance of supervision, can do no more than run over to the public production and make his report as an unconsulted member of the audience :—

"Yesterday, Saturday 7th January, first performance of Lohengrin at Leipzig.—The very numerous audience (at doubled prices) shewed decided sympathy and admiration for this marvellous work"—he begins in stereotyped phrase, to Wagner. "The first act was fairly satisfactorily rendered by the company ; Rietz conducted with precision and decency; the ensemble pieces had been carefully rehearsed [say rather, the last half of this act had already been given twice, a twelvemonth previously]. The second and third acts, however, suffered from many slips and faults on the part alike of chorus and principals; these will certainly mend at the next performances, though the Leipzig theatre does not possess the needful artists. The same dragging in the second act which I have taken the liberty of remarking to you before [!] was very perceptible on this occasion, and a tiredness in the audience became painfully visible. The tempi of the choruses, scene three [act ii], to me seemed a long way too fast, —moreover, there were several breakdowns in this scene." Small wonder, then, that the audience was wearied by the second act at least. Yet Liszt goes on to speak of its being "no longer possible to dispute a magnificent success for the work," albeit he has next to nothing to adduce in support of such a statement so far as concerns Leipzig: "The performers, with

---

symphony to the Gewandhaus Committee, and only if it passes their censorship can it be executed in November ; they wish to measure the ocean by the foot-rule of criticism ; much good may it do them.—Brendel, Moscheles and Langer [conductor of the university-choir 'Paulus,' who brought his young people to sing the *Liebesmahl* at Ballenstedt in 1852] are the only ones who have returned my call . . . I found the orchestra very good here, but the first Gewandhaus concert did not edify me much . . . For myself, they have refused to let me play in the same concert at which my symphony will be given ; so that, if I hold to giving precedence to my composition, I cannot play till about the end of November. I go to see nobody, because nobody comes to see me."

Rietz and Wirsing, were called after the first act—and after the last the principal characters appeared again. T.,* who had come from Paris for this production, was much displeased with the performance: I moderated him, as I consider it by no means *à propos* to harm the main affair by detailed criticism. Before all, let it be recorded that Lohengrin is the most glorious work of art we yet possess, and that the Leipzig theatre has done itself an honour by producing it.—If you have to write to Leipzig in the next few days, do me the favour of adopting a friendly attitude in recognition of the good will and success which are not to be doubted. The only observation I would suggest you should make, is with regard to the fastness of the choruses in the third scene (act 2) and of Lohengrin's 'Athmest du nicht,' giving them a *metronomic* indication; the more so, as the chorus positively broke down there, and the passages could not produce their infallible effect."

Really, in such matters, Liszt's "diplomatic weakness"—the term is Wagner's (to F. H. a week later)—appears incorrigible. Rietz and Wirsing had positively flouted him; yet he offers the other cheek. They had deliberately evaded Wagner's "conditio sine quâ non"; yet Liszt can speak of "good will," and positively ask his friend to thank them! And then the "honour" the Leipzig theatre had done itself, with an opera the second and third acts whereof had never been properly rehearsed! No, no: fine words butter no parsnips, and forbearance can be carried too far when so much is at stake.

The futility of buttering is demonstrated by Wagner's answer, in his letter of Jan. 15: "Beyond your own (so amiable!) report on the Leipzig Lohengrin, I have also received that of the 'Deutsche Allgemeine,' and learn from it the mocking penalty for the crime I committed two years since against my inmost conscience, when I became untrue to my imperative principle and consented to performances of my operas. . . . Don't think

* See Liszt's letter of Oct. 31, '53: "How goes it with Tyskiewiz? Did you see him once or twice again in Paris?"—also letters 121 and 122. The young man had sent an unfavourable report to the *Neue Zft* of June 10, '53, on the manner in which *Tannhäuser* had been produced at Posen. Jan. 13, '54, Hans von Bülow writes his mother: "I am here in Leipzig since the day before yesterday . . . I have become very intimate with Tyskiewicz, who is quite a prize specimen of an art-fanatic."

me plunged into sudden despair by the Leipzig tidings. I had a presentiment of this, knew it all in advance.* I can also imagine that the Leipzig case may still be repaired, that 'it's not so bad as one may think'—and all that sort of thing. Maybe:—but let me have evidence!—I believe no more, and know but one remaining hope: a *sleep*, a *sleep* so deep, so deep—that all sensation of life's pain shall cease."

Taken by itself, the report in the *Deutsche Allg. Ztg* (Jan. 10, '54) might have been a shade ambiguous: read in the light of Liszt's account, it was an obvious euphemism for *failure*, with the blame allotted to the work, not to its mode of performance. Neutral in tone, its language is so tortuous that I have difficulty in making an intelligible extract, yet a phrase or two must be cited in confirmation of Wagner's estimate:—"An almost completely full house, for the most part drawn from the cultured classes . . . A success such as was bound to arise from a first hearing by a well-disposed public . . . The first act enthused the audience, whereas the excessive preponderance of recitative and almost total absence of musical stimulus made the second pass unnoticed . . . Thus the enthusiasm, which in course of the first hour had visibly waxed, gradually faded to a meagre recognition at the end. In agreement with the audience, your reporter felt that 'Lohengrin' might indeed be a valuable acquisition to the operatic repertoire, round which the friends of the ingenious and sublime would rally many another time, but that it never could share the growing interest of the larger public in its elder brother." The reporter ominously proceeds to the "pecuniary risk" in mounting such works at a theatre run by a private lessee, and pleads with the Leipzig public not to be deterred by "difficulties and strangenesses in 'Lohengrin' that repel at a first hearing," but kindly to repay Director Wirsing for his pluck: *ad misericordiam* with a vengeance! A tribute is also meted to Rietz and the band; but, save for an incidental allusion to "sundry imperfections," not a word is devoted to the singers (or sinners); they are explicitly reserved for judgment when a renewed hearing shall have enabled the distracted critic "duly to judge the opera's merits and defects."

---

* "According to my will and stipulation," he says in his next to Liszt, "the Leipzig production would *not have come off*."

Wrapped in a swathing of verbiage, "fiasco" is to be read in wellnigh every line of the above; and far more distinctly than if the *D. A. Z.* review had betrayed the least hostility. The cause of that fiasco has been mildly stated by Liszt, though he claims the effect as "success." Now let us hear Pohl on both these points. Signing himself "Hoplit" (his usual anagram), and dating his report on the same day as Liszt's letter, namely Jan. 8, '54, he contributes to the *Neue Zeitschrift* of Jan. 13 an article covering three whole pages, ending with these significant words, "Even *such* a performance was unable to *kill* Wagner's sublime work of art!" Earlier in the article we read: "Enthusiasm was *impossible*, even among those who long had known and honoured *Lohengrin* above all else . . . Even those numbers which had already roused veritable storms of applause in the concert-room, such as the bridal procession and the male choruses, left one cold—a fact *incomprehensible* to anyone who *has not seen* the Leipzig first performance . . . We assure Hr Wirsing that, if he continues to present us with Lohengrin in *such* a form, he will have nothing but empty benches after the third performance." To Rietz and the band Pohl is outwardly lenient, though he comments on the paucity of orchestral rehearsals (199 *ant.*), and his general criticism chimes with, or perhaps is based on that of Liszt: "Rietz' tempi were fairly appropriate; though wellnigh always too fast, an actual *outrage* was never done to tempo, as previously in *Tannhäuser*." Yet the severest condemnation of the conductor himself is implicit in Pohl's remark, "We regard the whole thing as a mere *rehearsal*, and have still to *await* the first *representation*."* As to the

* In after years Pohl writes: "To *Lohengrin's* misfortune, Leipzig was one of the earliest theatres to follow Weimar in producing it [Wiesbaden alone had intervened]. At Leipzig, which still was soaked in Mendelssohn-worship, Julius Rietz—a friend of Mendelssohn's youth and a declared opponent of Wagner—wielded an absolute dictatorship at the Gewandhaus and theatre. Now, when Rietz had to yield to the importunity of the then director Wirsing, a regular coulisse-routinier—naturally prompted by no other motive than that of doing 'good business'—he flew to the red pencil and slashed the score in a way to make the skin of every Wagner-student creep. Moreover this production was a *miserable* one, alike in cast and execution, bound to be a hindrance in every direction to the understanding and circulation of the work. And worst of all: enjoying the reputation of an exceptionally 'reliable' Kapellmeister, Rietz was copied with a 'piety' his colleagues thought fit to withhold from the poet-composer himself. The Rietzian cuts made the round

lessee of the theatre, "We have not the smallest occasion to thank Director Wirsing for the production of Lohengrin. He knows, as well as we, what splendid *business* he has done with *Tannhäuser*, and that it was out of pure speculation he put Lohengrin upon his boards . . . He was determined to give Lohengrin before the Leipzig *Fair* was over. Hence these few and hurried rehearsals, this meaningless pomp, this want of certainty and understanding on part of the performers . . . There is something truly terrible in such a trafficking with the stage! . . . Lucky for Wagner, that he was not here! Wagner had promised himself great things from the Leipzig production . . . Well for him, that he was spared the pain of witnessing with his own eyes such a degradation of his work of art!"

The consequences of the murder of *Lohengrin* at Leipzig would have been serious enough in any case, as that was the first large town to mount the opera, and the ears of Germany were naturally aprick for its verdict. But there was a far more instant issue depending on this première. The Härtels having declined to buy the opera's performing-rights, stock, lock, and barrel, Wagner's financial pinch had forced him to look elsewhere: "I write to my theatrical agent [Michaelson] in Berlin"—he says in the letter of Jan. 15—"he procures me the prospect of a good purchaser, whom I refer to the first performance at Leipzig. Now that has taken place, and my agent writes me that after *such* a success it had not been possible to induce the purchaser to clinch the bargain, though he had been willing enough before." The would-be investor, as Wagner gathers soon after, was a well-known firm of music-dealers, "Bote und Bock" of Berlin (see Letter 150 to L.), and nothing could more plainly prove the depth of the disaster. These shrewd business people of course would send a

---

of most of the boards—even Eduard Devrient (likewise a friend of Mendelssohn's youth) acquired them for his 'model theatre' at Carlsruhe. Thus it became a standing article of belief, that Lohengrin *without cuts was impossible.*" On one point in the above Pohl lies open to correction, for there is negative evidence in his own article of Jan. '54, and positive in Liszt's letter of the same date, that the first Leipzig performance of *Lohengrin* was un-curtailed; the "red pencil" must have been set to work immediately afterwards, to remedy the depressing effect of an execution so miserable that Wagner tells Roeckel (Jan. 26, '54, after a private report of Pohl's?), "Among other things, not an articulate word could be heard the whole evening—barring those of the Herald!"

representative to Leipzig, to take personal stock of the work's reception: from "*such* a success" they rightly augured that it would require years for *Lohengrin* to recover. In effect, after Leipzig, five theatres alone mount *Lohengrin* in 1854; merely another five in '55; followed by three in '56 and none (i.e. no fresh ones) in '57: whereas there was scarcely one of the forty-odd stages in Germany that had not mounted *Tannhäuser* long before the year last-named.* When the real period of the active spread of *Lohengrin* began, namely in the sixties, we know that it rapidly distanced its "elder brother" in popularity; and there is no reason to suppose that it would not have done so a decad earlier, had the Leipzig hash not scared the great majority of managers from venturing the "risk."

That was the blow under which the composer was staggering when he drafted those stirring last pages of his *Rheingold* music. "Rheingold! Rheingold! *Reines* Gold! wie lauter und hell leuchtetest hold du uns!" sing the Rhinedaughters; and Wagner cries to Liszt, "Ah, how pure and single-eyed I was two years ago, when I had *you* and *Weimar* alone in view, refused to hear of any other theatre, and entirely renounced all outer success. All that is past! I have broken my principle; my pride is gone, and now I have humbly to bow my neck beneath the yoke of Jews and philistines!" All that to earn the means to write the music of his *Ring* in peace and comfort. "But how infamous, that this bartering of my noblest possession shouldn't

* The Weimar production of *Lohengrin* in August 1850 was followed by no other theatre for close upon three years. But the rapidly-growing success of *Tannhäuser* had already led to various inquiries for its companion when little Wiesbaden gave *Lohengrin* a fresh start in July '53. To Leipzig succeeded Schwerin (a *Tannh.* pioneer) on the 15th Jan. '54, its preparations having of course been made long previously. Then came Frankfort (the conductor being a friend of Liszt's) April 12, and Darmstadt (friendly Schindelmeisser) Apr. 17. Breslau (another *Tannh.* pioneer) followed Oct. 31, and Stettin in November. In 1855 we find Cologne, Jan. 4 (? 11); Hamburg, Jan. 19; Prague, Feb. 23; Riga, also Feb.; and Hanover, Dec. 16. The year 1856 merely brings Wurzburg, March 29; Mainz, Apr. 2; and Carlsruhe, Dec. 26. To complete the fifties, we have in 1858 Munich (Feb. 28), Sondershausen (Mar. 26), Vienna (Aug. 19); in 1859 Mannheim (Jan. 9), Berlin (Jan. 23), and Dresden, Aug. 6—over eleven years after the scoring was completed there! Thus, reckoning from 1852, the era when Wagner's operas really began to make their way, we find *Lohengrin* taking *seven* years to invade the same number of theatres as *Tannhäuser* had conquered in two.

even bring me the pay that seemed assured me in return! It leaves me a beggar to boot, as before! Dear Franz, not one of my latter years has passed without bringing me at least *once* to the extreme verge of the determination to put an end to my life. Everything in it is so waste, so lost! . . . This agony of want and care for a life that I hate, that I curse!—and for that to make myself ridiculous even in the eyes of those who visit my house—and then to taste the additional bliss of having delivered up the hitherto *noblest work* of my life to the foreknown bungling of our theatre-crew and the derision of the philistine. God, what I think of myself! Had I but the satisfaction, that somebody *knew* what I think of myself!" Mere bemoaning, however, will not mend matters now; Liszt "must help" in a practical way—not from his purse, which Wagner knows to be slender, but: "If I am to regain the power to *hold out* (and I mean *much* by that word!) something *thorough* must be done on the road now entered of the prostitution of my art,—else all is up with me. Have you not thought of Berlin again? Something **must** be brought off there now, if everything is not to come to a dead stop." In other words, *Tannhäuser* must repair in Berlin the fiasco of *Lohengrin* at Leipzig: whether it will, we shall learn later on.

The immediate question, is how to raise the wind. Härtels have behaved handsomely enough, over the Nine Vocal Pieces from *Lohengrin*, "but of what use to me are hundreds [of thalers] when thousands are needed?" Leipzig has exploded every other pending combination. Had the Berlin negotiator for the general performing-rights of *Lohengrin* but received a favourable report, "Even a *firm offer* would at least have enabled me, as proof of 'capital,' to obtain a three-year loan of the sum I need from a man of business here. That hope is now done for. Only somebody who had a personal faith in my future (?) successes, would agree to such a transaction. Such a *man*, dearest Franz, you *must* find me. Once more—to place me in a perfect state of equilibrium—I require from three to four thousand thalers. So much my operas ought easily to bring in, *if* something decent is done at once to rescue *Lohengrin;* and my whole rights over Tannhäuser and Lohengrin I would mortgage to the lender in any mode desired.—If I'm not worth such a service—you will admit that things stand badly with me, and everything has been an illusion!!! . . . Help me over this—and I will *hold out* once

more.—Don't be angry with me, dear friend; I have a claim on you as my *creator*. You *are* the creator of my present self: *through you* am I alive to-day—that is no exaggeration. Look after your creation, then: it is a duty you have, I tell you. . . . You are the *only one* I let know about this: nobody else has a suspicion of it, least of all my immediate surrounding." The claim on Liszt was justified by more than the very cogent plea advanced; Wagner is too delicate to put it in so many words, yet had Liszt but abode by the letter and spirit of his friend's "conditio sine quâ non," the Leipzig catastrophe could hardly have occurred. In all probability there would have been no *Lohengrin* production there at all; but *Tannhäuser* had done very well before Leipzig's patronage, and so might its successor have: at any rate, in the eyes of an intending purchaser, nothing could have been more prohibitive than a mere *succès d'estime* at a noted musical centre. Unfortunately, however, the same cause that had deterred the business man would frighten the friendly admirer; and Liszt was likely to be as powerless as Wagner himself to make a horse drink, though he led it to the water, especially when the privilege was to involve the putting up of some five to six hundred pounds sterling.

The day after this letter, which Wagner describes as "god-forsaken,"* his thoughts must have been welcomely distracted by a rehearsal of the *Euryanthe* overture and Beethoven's Eighth Symphony, as he conducts those works at the Zurich Panharmonic on the 17th Jan. Two days after that, again, he devotes his morning to a discussion of F. Heine's printed sketches for the *Lohengrin* inscenation (see iii, 504-12), adding: "How unhappy I now feel at not being able to present the opera myself, I scarce need tell you. For my chagrin about this, it did not first require the latest Leipzig assassination. As to that, Fischer will probably be having a good laugh at me, and com-

* Followed by "Be thou God's Saint—for in thee alone do I still believe: ay, ay! and once more, *ay*." Just above had come the message, "I shall send you my portrait in a few days, with a motto that perhaps may puzzle you." Whether this was a new photograph, I cannot say, but we hear of Liszt's possessing a portrait of Wagner's with the motto "Du weisst wie das wird!" ("Thou know'st how 'twill be!"); in an interrogative form we met the same allusion to the Norns' scene in that dedication of the sonata to Frau Wesendonk (*vid.* 131 *ant.* and Appendix).

paring my punctilios about Dresden with my Leipzig levity. I can't help it, if he doesn't know the true state of affairs." Then follows the account already-given of Liszt's capitulation; but the general tone is fairly cheerful, and Fischer is begged to correct and send a score of the *Holländer* for performance at Wiesbaden: "*Tannhäuser* also must be held in readiness, for orders are again under way"—suggesting another sheaf of business correspondence in this brief interval of 'rest' that follows *Rheingold's* composition.

Apart from such business routine, practically the whole of this interval is filled with the backlash from the Leipzig explosion of firedamp, wave succeeding wave of despondence or sardonic mirth. "When I turn to the reality, I could weep the whole day long"—Frau Ritter is told Jan. 20, the day after the letter to Heine—"The absurdest merriment often takes me in the selfsame hour as the most murderous gloom. . . . In summer the Walküre shall be set to music, and the end of next year I expect to have finished with the two Siegfrieds as well. In May 1858 the representations of the whole work shall begin, here in Zurich:—if I'm not alive by then, so much the better. Then Rietz will probably produce the whole at Leipzig for my funeral:—it would be of a piece with all my life." * By this time the *N.Z.* of the 13th, with Pohl's article (204 *ant.*), must have reached his hands; for Bülow—who also appears to have been communicated with, probably on the 21st—writes Liszt from Dresden on the 27th: "I have written Wagner, to calm him a little on the subject of the *fiasco* of his Lohengrin at Leipzig. Ritter joined with me in this good work. Richard Wagner was bursting with the insanest projects; for example, of demanding his amnesty from the King, of delivering himself up to the Government, etc.; and all this is the result of Hoplit's article." Secondarily, perhaps; but Hans was presumably unaware that Wagner had previous and independent testimony of the Leipzig defeat in the message from his Berlin agent. Hans, however, had

---

* Cf. letter to Fischer of Feb. 15: "*Rheingold* I did not begin until November. Next summer I shall start the *Walküre;* in Spring 1855 will come *Young Siegfried,* and that winter I expect to take *Siegfried's Death* in hand; so that all will be finished by Easter 1856. Then will commence the Impossible: to erect my own theatre, with which to present my work to all Europe as a grand dramatic music-festival. Then—grant God I may breathe my last sigh!"

just spent five days in Leipzig (Jan. 11 to 16) on his way to a Weimar visit, with a day or two on his return (Jan. 24); consequently his choice of the word "fiasco" acquires double force from the absence of any reference to a repetition of the performance thitherto, whilst his opinion of Pohl's wisdom in telling the naked truth would be coloured by that of Liszt.

Wagner's next outpouring is to Liszt again; letter 145, undated, but traceable to about the 23rd or 24th Jan., since what Hans has described as the "insanest projects" are here spoken of in the past tense. "I write you again, to try if I can somewhat ease my heart. This continuous *suffering* is really becoming unbearable in the end: to be always obliged to let things roll over one, never allowed to give the wheel a turn oneself—were it even to one's own destruction—is enough to make the meekest man revolt at last. I feel I must act, do something! . . . And so the wish revived in me the last few days more vehemently than ever, to make for my amnesty and free access to Germany. Then I could at least be *active*, in the sense of benefiting the representations of my operas: I could present *Lohengrin* for once myself, at last, instead of torturing myself about it. For a moment this really seemed to me the most needful step of all, to repair the Leipzig disaster:—I would almost have ventured there *without* a pass, eh! risked my personal freedom ('freedom,' good God! what an irony!). Next, in quieter moments, I wanted to write to the King of Saxony—till that also was bound to strike me as utterly futile, even dishonouring. Then—until last night in fact—I thought of writing to the Grand Duke, setting forth my new predicament, to move him to an energetic intervention at Dresden. This morning I have come to the conclusion that that also would be fruitless, and probably you will agree—for where is one to find *energy*, where an actual *will?* Everything has to be in halves, quarters — or mere tenths or twelfths, à la X. So here I sit once more, fold my arms, and surrender myself to unmitigated grief!—I can *do* nothing—nothing but make my Nibelungen—and that itself I shall be unable to do without great and energetic help—! Best, unique friend, hear me! Nothing *can* I do, if others don't do it for me. The sale of my rights in my operas *must* be effected at once, if I'm not to tear myself by violence from my present situation. That sale has been made impossible in the ordinary way of business by the

Leipzig performance, and can be effected as nothing but an act of friendship now. . . . To *you alone* can I say how painful is my plight, how needful to me is swift help. It really is most *urgent*, and indispensable for the preservation of my whole future. With my enormous sensitiveness in this matter [forbidding him to lay the case before Wesendonk or Sulzer, for instance?]—and as I do not wish to take my life on such a frivolous pretext —nothing else remains for me, but to pack my traps and make straight for America." For he has heard that "Wagner-nights" are already being given in Boston, and some unnamed correspondent over there (? Eckhardt, late of Dresden—see ii, 252*n*) is imploring him to cross the seas and "make a heap of money."

What actual opening may then have existed for him in the United States, I must leave our transatlantic cousins to discover*; but the idea of "*America*" (also of "*London*") had already figured for a moment in the letter of Jan. 15. Here it is discussed at some length, quite seriously, and dismissed for two practical reasons: first, how could he decently get out of his new quarters?—presumably with a longish 'agreement' on the strength whereof his landlady had made certain structural alterations; second, it would be a deathblow to the music for his RING: "This *work* is in truth the *only thing* that preserves me any taste for life. If I think of sacrifices, and ask for sacrifices, it is solely for this work; since in it alone can I still perceive any object for this life of mine. For its sake must I hold on, and here too, where at least I have planted my foot and settled down to work."

I have drawn so largely on this letter 145 to Liszt, not only because of its biographic details, but also because of the unique light it casts on the despotism of genius. Let us therefore have its closing sentences: "I'm full of woes—and his love must

---

* The first I can hear of any such thing is five months later, at a monster concert given by Jullien in the New York Crystal Palace June 15, when the *Tannh.* overture had "a success on a par with that which it has achieved in England" (Apr.) "music in a state of chaos seems to excite in the Anglo-Saxon mind neither admiration nor wonder" (New York corresp. *Mus. World*, July 8, '54). As Jullien's huge band included "orchestral artists and amateurs from Boston," however, there may be some ground for Wagner's estimate.

bring torment to a friend like you: I know it!—Give me up, if you can:—that will settle it.—With this raging anxiety my nerve-pain has returned in full force: during work, this time, I had often felt quite well [p. 188 *ant.*]. . . . The children of legend already had approached the weeping pixy, and cried to him, 'Weep not; even thou mayst be blest.' But farther and farther still their cry withdrew, till at last I could hear it no longer: silence!—Old Night has me again—let her engulf me altogether! —Forgive me—I *cannot* help it!—Farewell, my Franz! farewell, farewell!" (Out of order as the remark may be, I cannot refrain from observing that Liszt leaves alike this plaintive cry and the letter of Jan. 15 unanswered by a word until the 21st of February, though he excuses his silence by pressure of occupation and other worries.—W. A. E.)

That American proposal crops up at the end of the epistle to August Roeckel of Jan. 25 and 26: "In *Boston* they are already giving *Wagner-nights*, evening concerts where none but my compositions are performed. I am invited to come to America: if they could provide me suitable means there [for producing the operas], who knows what I might do? But merely to tour about as concert-giver, even for a heap of money, really no one can expect of me!" One of the most interesting features of this immensely long effusion is the proof it affords of Wagner's elasticity of spirits. The worst mental effects of his recent disappointment have apparently been worked off in the various missives discussed above, for he ends this epistle to his captive friend with "Hope—for, after all, I hope myself." Here the *Lohengrin* débâcle is dismissed in very few words: "My *Tannhäuser* is given almost everywhere in Germany now; anyhow, all the smaller theatres have taken it up, though the largest still hold aloof—for explicable reasons. As to the performances themselves, I mostly hear they are miserable, so that I can't make out whence comes the liking. As I don't see any of them, however, I have become a little callous to these prostitutions of my works:* merely a recent first performance of *Lohengrin* at

* See 206-7 *ant.*, also to Fischer Feb. 15: "Our 'theatres' may drag my older operas now through all the mire of vulgarity:—I have given them up, and let everything take its course, since I could expect nothing good: you know my disgust! The only thing that still has interest for me in them, is the money I can draw from this my prostitution by the German theatres; for

Leipzig has made an acutely painful impression upon me. It is said to have been unexampledly bad; among other points, not an articulate word was to be heard the whole evening—barring those of the Herald!—So I repent, after all, having made my works away." Certainly he is beginning to take the matter philosophically.

Philosophy, in fact, of a more or less Positive cast, forms the groundwork of this noted letter; and curious it is to find so strong a tinge of Feuerbachism barely nine months before acquaintance with Schopenhauer's system throws the whole paraphernalia of abstractions overboard. I much doubt that this recrudescence would have occurred at all, had it not been in response to some shibboleth of Roeckel's ("You see, I am taking quite your standpoint here: only" etc.). Wherefore I regard the bulk of this epistle as an anachronism in its author's brain-life, a momentary harking-back to the period before his Ring-poem stood complete. In any case, its second half—the "interpretation" to which I have already referred (11-3, 90-1 *ant.*)—rather seeks to fit the poem to the dialectics of the first, than to expound it to the "naïve man"; it is not a spontaneous utterance, but extorted from Wagner at a disadvantage ("You are very wrong to call me to account"), much as had been the reply to Stahr's criticisms on *Lohengrin* (iii, 493). Still less was it intended for publicity; an unwilling rejoinder, never subjected to cool reflection. On one point at least, to my mind, the commentary is positively misleading: namely, the light in which it impliedly sets the character of Loge. Speaking of the curse that rests on the ring, "not to be removed till it is restored to Nature, the gold plunged back in the Rhine," Wagner here says that Wotan does not learn this lesson "ere quite the close of his tragic career: what *Loge* had repeatedly and touchingly impressed on him at the beginning, the luster-after-power overlooked the most," and so on. This would turn Loge into a benevolent mentor, whereas there is not a line he utters

---

the rest—I have closed the book, and only wonder when I hear of some good point in the performances from time to time." Needless to say, this callousness must not be read too literally, for the same correspondent is told next August: "I feel no craving for Germany itself, and am glad enough to escape seeing all the bad performances of my operas there, which would probably break my heart."

that does not bear the stamp of mischievous delight in the embroglio into which he has dragged these scornful employers of his; mockery is the characteristic not only of his words, but also of his music, even of that delicious *arioso* "Was gleicht, Wotan, wohl deinem Glücke?" following Fafner's murder of Fasolt for sake of the ring.—So soon after composition of the *Rheingold* music, it would be strange to find its author thus confounding the issues of its plot, were there not sufficient explanation in the turmoil into which his nerves had been flung for a fortnight by that wretched *Lohengrin* affair. However, as remarked in cap. II., we need dwell no longer on this famous "interpretation," as it is virtually revoked hereafter (letter to R. of Aug. 23, '56), and Wagner remarks even here, "You have every right to criticise, but I have right when I make and carry out the thing as I am able." Who wants a prose key to that Eleusinian music clothing the apparition of Erda?

Of greater historic import is the following:—"How I am to bring the ultimate performance of the whole work about, is still a mighty problem. I shall attack it when the time comes, notwithstanding, as I should otherwise see no object left me in life. I'm tolerably certain that all the purely mechanical side can be managed [*cf.* 71 *ant.*]: but—my performers?! When I think of them, I heave a big sigh. Naturally I must stand out for young people, not yet quite ruined by our operatic stage: so-called 'celebrities' I absolutely taboo. How I am to get hold of my young world, remains to be seen; preferably I would shepherd my troop for a whole year before letting them make a public appearance, during which time I should have to be among them every day, training them alike as men and artists, and letting them slowly ripen for their task. In the most fortunate circumstances, accordingly, I could not count on a first performance before the summer of 1858.* Let it be as remote as it will, however, it attracts me to assume in so absorbing a pursuit of a goal of my own a compulsion still to live."

After all we have read about the Life of the Future, not only in the earlier part of this letter, but elsewhere, it is instructive to see how Roeckel's counsels of perfection are dealt with: "Believe

* See the letter of six days earlier to Frau Ritter (209 *ant.*).

me, I have already had the 'agriculturist' too in eye. To become a radically healthy human, I went to a hydropathic establishment two years since ; art and all that sort of thing I meant to give up, if I could but become a Natural man again. Best friend, how I had to laugh at my naïve wish, when I came nigh to going crazy! Not one of us will see the promised land: we all shall perish in the wilderness. Brains—as somebody has said—are a malady: 'tis incurable. With our present life, Nature permits none but abnormities: in the happiest event we must become martyrs ; and whoso would fain withdraw from that calling, simply kicks against his possibilities of existence. I can do nothing else now, than go on existing as artist: all the rest [politics &c.]—since I can compass Life and Love no more—either disgusts me, or has interest for me solely insofar as it bears on Art. 'Tis an agonising life, to be sure, yet 'tis the only life possible." So Roeckel's counsel to "return to Nature"—the parrot-cry of doctrinaires who know nothing of Nature at bottom—is declined with thanks.

One other word ere we leave this human document. Towards its close, Wagner regrets his inability to send the prisoner any fresh book that might interest him: "for I myself have grown quite a stranger to reading of late." Here we assuredly have a hint of the cause of the improvement in his nerves the last few months (*before* the Lohengrin upset): "Can I truly say my nerves are ruined?" he asks in this selfsame letter. The temporary desistence from reading print at night, through relieving his eye-strain, would mend his more conscious sufferings.—This by the way ; but we must glean our symptoms as we go along.

Besides the letters discussed above, and an indefinite number of business ones, we hear of another to Spohr in this interval between the composition and scoring of *Rheingold.* Almost certainly it treated of the older master's desire to give *Lohengrin* at Cassel, but I am not in a position to furnish either its precise date or its tenour. It is the last of Wagner's letters to Spohr of which there is any extant mention, though we can hardly imagine that it actually terminated their correspondence.

About a fortnight had elapsed since the 'composition-draft' of *Das Rheingold* was finished, when Wagner commenced its scoring, at the beginning of February 1854. A few days later he sends dumb Liszt a tiny "sign of life," Feb. 7: "I now am putting

'Rheingold' into instrumental score straight off. I could devise no mode of writing out a clear sketch of the prelude (the depths of the Rhine)*; so I jumped at once to the full score. Only, this will be much slower work to finish: also my head is somewhat dizzy." In the last clause we see the evidence of eye-fatigue again. Take even a cursory glance at the score of this prelude—with its eight 'real parts' for the horns alone, and its separate staves amounting to an average total of 24, with an extreme of 31 during a few successive bars—and you may realise the intensity of the mere mechanical strain on the eyes in writing all this down with Wagner's well-known precision when engaged on the final phase of any work. To quote Mr H. T. Finck again: "Laymen can have no conception of the enormous amount of labour involved in the writing and rewriting of such scores as Wagner's. There must be at least a million notes in the full score of the *Walküre*, and each of these million notes has to be not only written and rewritten, but written in its proper place, with a view to its relations to a score of other notes; and the composer, in doing this, must keep in view harmonic congruity, avoid incongruous or inappropriate combinations of colour, transpose wood-wind parts, etc.! As Heinrich Dorn, himself a composer of operas, remarks, in commenting on the 'colossal industry' which Wagner displayed in the time between *Lohengrin* and the completion of the *Nibelung's Ring:* 'No one who has not himself written scores, can comprehend what it means to achieve such a task in comparatively so short a time; and one who does comprehend it, must be doubly astounded at this exhausting and colossal activity.'"

There you have the testimony of one not altogether friendly

* "Ich konnte keine Weise finden, das Vorspiel (die Rheines-Tiefe) als Skizze deutlich aufzuschreiben." Though Wagner here speaks of the impossibility of making a "*clear* sketch" of this introduction, it cannot be supposed that, as with the preludes to *Lohengrin* and its predecessors, he had left its *conception* to the last. Upon these opening pages the whole succeeding scene is built, and it would have been impossible for him to begin the composition of his work at all (Nov. '53) without at least a rough draft of them, a general indication of their thematic working-out and instrumenting. What he here means by a "clear sketch" is obviously a Compressed Score, and that, of course, would be out of the question with so complex a piece of orchestration as either the exordium or the peroration of *Rheingold.*

rival (Dorn); here is that of a much greater:—In 1879 R. Heuberger had asked Brahms for an opinion on some songs of his; after discussing their artistic merits (no concern of ours), "Brahms thought even the mechanical side of writing worth a comment. He found that I had not placed crotchet below crotchet, and had thereby impaired the ease of reading; he bade me pay attention to accuracy in marking the slur above groups of notes, to drawing down the tails of notes above the middle line of a stave, and upward those below it; to placing the sharps or flats of a key-signature exactly on the line or space intended for them—in short, to devoting more care to the seeming mere externals of musical notation. 'See here,' he said, and brought from the adjoining room Wagner's autograph [litho-ed] score of 'Tannhäuser,' which he opened at the long B major passage in the second act. 'On *every* page, on *every* line, Wagner has studiously set each of the five sharps exactly in its proper place; and yet, for all this precision, it is written fluently and freely! If another man can write *thus* so neatly, you must learn it also.' He went through each page of the passage, and belaboured me with almost every cross he came on. The more Brahms worked himself into a kind of didactic passion, the less had I to say for myself. But when I finally remarked that 'Wagner was chiefly responsible for all manner of confusion in the heads of us young people,' Brahms struck me dumb; for he jumped up as if someone had stabbed him, 'Nonsense—it is the *misunderstood* Wagner that has done you this; of the real Wagner those understand *nothing* who go astray through him. Wagner is one of the clearest heads that ever came into the world'" (*Die Musik* 1902-3, p. 328).

If the 'capacity for taking infinite pains' is one of the most distinctive attributes of genius, with Wagner it was a positive passion. But still more remarkable, in the present instance, is the fact of his being able to proceed at once to this most complicated operation without making a preliminary miniature or 'compressed' score, or even a detailed sketch of the various instrumental combinations. The whole orchestration of this *Rheingold* prelude must already have stood complete in his head, with all its colour and its figuration, for him to give each instrument its proper share forthwith. One reads of the wonder

which Mendelssohn and Liszt aroused in their audiences by improvising on two themes at once; but to carry this harmonious organism of countless registers within his brain, in a sort of mental photograph, while nothing but the barest suggestion of two to three linked staves had found its way as yet to paper —that is something far more marvellous, and perhaps unparalleled. Polyphony can never have come more naturally to any symphonist. 'Infinity of pains' alone could not have done it, however indispensable for the mere mechanical record.

This method of "full-scoring straight off" seems to have been pursued for at least the best part of a fortnight, as old Fischer is informed Feb. 15, "Already I am making the orchestral score of *Rheingold*." Probably Wagner is taking a rest that morning, however, since there has been a slight interruption the previous day by the fifth of the Panharmonic winter-concerts, at which he conducted the *Leonora* overture (and Gluck's to *Iph. in Aulis?*). On the 21st comes the sixth concert, the last of the regular series, when he conducts the *Freischütz* overture and Mozart's 'Jupiter' symphony.*

Apart from these engagements, each of which must have

* "At one of those concerts Wagner conducted the overture to Freischütz," says Frau Wille, and lays a whole garland of flowers of speech on the work. "I was fortunate enough to be sitting right at the back, where the pleasure of hearing was not disturbed by sight. I had the same enjoyment whenever Wagner conducted a symphony of Beethoven's—I felt happy that the Beautiful should thrive on earth." Not much history in that kind of remark; but it is followed by a confession which gives the coup de grace to all this lady's washy recollections of the fifties: "I now find a gap in my jottings and reminiscences, so that I have to skip almost a whole year . . . Not till the year 1854 can I return to what will interest the reader, as concerning Wagner. It was in the autumn of that year, that Liszt paid another visit to Zurich; this time in the company of the Princess Wittgenstein and her princess daughter." Total and irremediable confusion; for Liszt's second visit occurred in the year 1856 —not 1854— whereas the "winter concerts" to which Frau Wille has previously referred, took place in 1854 and the Casino, not "in the old Museum." This merely to shew that no more trust can be reposed in these dateless or misdated "jottings" than in others of their class. One little thread from the tangled skein is worth rescuing, however: "Talking of these concerts, I ought to mention the surprise with which, in the pauses, I heard the local patois spoken between ladies in full evening-dress and their attendant cavaliers" (*Fünfzehn Briefe &c.* 78-80). The Willes thus stand self-confessed as among those "intelligent friends" of whom we heard in vol. iii (p. 156) in connection with Wagner's *Theatre at Zurich*.

monopolised from two to three days of his available time, his leisure for work has been seriously menaced by the sudden bankruptcy of the Zurich theatrical lessee. "When Richard Wagner learnt the tragic end of our theatre (about which he had not bothered himself at all this season)"—writes a local correspondent to the *N. Berl. Mus. Ztg* of Feb. 22, '54—"he promptly conceived plans for the company's benefit." Contemporary rumour even credited him with the idea of assuming the management itself, for, according to T. Zolling in the *Gegenwart* of 1897, a protocol of the theatre-committee dated Feb. 6, '54, ends as follows: "Finally the joyful news was brought to the meeting, that Herr Richard Wagner had expressed his willingness to take over the management, provided conditions could be agreed upon." Nothing more do we know of the alleged proposal, which even that protocol records on the merest hearsay ("*Kunde gebracht*" and "*die Geneigtheit ausgesprochen hat*"). On the face of it, it is most unlikely that Wagner would have consented under any "conditions" to burden himself with so thankless a task at such a time.

To some further interruption of his scoring he nevertheless submitted for sake of those poor singers and bandsmen thrown suddenly out of work in the depth of winter: he got up three extra concerts for them, conducting March 7 Gluck's overture to *Iphigenia in Aulis* and Beethoven's Pastoral symphony, on the 21st the *Tannhäuser* overture and Beethoven's Seventh symphony, on the 30th the *Egmont* overture, the *Tannhäuser* Entry of Guests and Beethoven's Eighth.* The *N. Zft* reports the organisation of these "three grand concerts" by Wagner, and adds that "their proceeds extricated many a member of the troupe from the severest embarrassments" (1854, I. 106). A pendant, therefore, to those other three Grand concerts of a year ago, which also brought no profit to the conductor. One wonders if a single member of the audience had the smallest suspicion that the concert-giver was himself in just as sore need of monetary help as these derelicts for whom he thus made sacrifice of energies needed to their last ounce for prosecution of the labours in his

* According to Herr Steiner's list of works conducted by Wagner in the winter 1853-4, Gluck's overture was given *twice*, Beethoven's Seventh sym. and *Egmont* ov. also twice. For the six subscription-concerts the conductor took a modest fee, but nothing for the three additional ones.

silent study. Let the denouncers of our hero's "selfishness" please make another note.

For the tightness of the grip into which he had fallen almost simultaneously with inception of the *Rheingold* music had in nowise been relaxed. When Liszt at last answered (Feb. 21) he could only say, "I have not forgotten your pecuniary affairs, and hope my expectations will not come to nought"; but those expectations, well-based or otherwise, are a matter of "next autumn," a long, long time to wait. Liszt's own affairs are "none too roseate," as he writes a few weeks later, "so that I am unable to assist a friend at present." He *has* a little scheme in view for Wagner's benefit (see cap. VII.), but anything on the scale required would naturally far exceed his power. So Wagner has to pacify his creditors as best he may, during the next few months; "Heaven knows how I'm going to help myself" (Apr. 9).

None too brilliant a background for the labour on which he is now engaged. "I'm working at high pressure," he tells Liszt March 4. "Can't you tell me of someone who would be capable of putting a tidy score together from my wild pencil-sketches? This time I am working quite differently from before. But the fair-copying kills me! I'm losing time by it, that I might put to so much better use; moreover the mass of writing takes so much out of me, that it makes me ill and robs me of the humour for my real [creative] work. Without a handy man of that sort I'm lost: *with* him the *whole* might be finished *in two years*. For so long I should need the man: if there came a pause in the score-writing, he could always fill it with copying out the *parts*. Do look around for me! Here there is nobody.—Certainly it sounds rather fabulous, that I should want to keep a secretary; I—who can barely keep myself. . . . When you think of me, think of me as constantly working,* or boundlessly melancholy!" There is an "or" in it, you see; the "melancholy" does not possess him when at work; only in his hours of recreation: but the eye-strain of this "mass of writing" is making him "ill."

---

* "I'm expecting Gustav Schmidt from Frankfort here on Monday:"—this letter also says—"I have summoned him, to go through Lohengrin with him. Perhaps he'll even bring his tenor too. I'm delighted he should shew such zeal!" Another interruption; but it was the only practical way to repair the havoc caused by Leipzig. Schmidt came, though without his tenor, and *Lohengrin* was produced at Frankfort April 12, '54. On the 26th Wagner

To judge by the above, the process of full-scoring in fair copy is still continued, and we may consequently argue that the whole of the first scene of *Rheingold* was executed thus. But the "wild pencil-sketches," as distinguished from the neat pen-and-ink product—what of them? Are they the 'composition' of Nov. '53 to Jan. '54—i.e. the first draft of the music—or secondary and more elaborated details of the instrumentation with which he is now occupied? Unfortunately the generally-cited letter to Fischer of March 2, '55, rather obscures the question than furnishes an answer: "I want to explain to you about the Rheingold score. Some years ago I promised my young friend [Bülow] that he should make the pianoforte edition of my Nibelungen. Now, as I was following a new procedure this time with the instrumentation, according to which I did not first make a completely worked-out composition-draft, I lacked an arrangement from which I could play something to others, and therefore begged my friend to begin making the pianoforte edition while I was still going on with the score" etc.—The difficulty here resides in the use of the word "composition-draft" in the same breath as "a new procedure with the instrumentation"—"*da ich diesmal bei der Instrumentation ein neues Verfahren befolgte, wonach ich nicht zuvor einen vollständig ausgearbeiteten Kompositionsentwurf verfasste.*" Trying to say too much in one sentence, Wagner here has said too little: yet he did not write it for the benefit of posterity, but merely as an apology to an old friend that a young one should have seen the manuscript first; and we have no right to grumble at its eluding our probe. If, however, you combine this sentence with that in the letter of Jan. 26 to Roeckel, *before* the so-called "instrumentation" had commenced—"The composition has become a firm-knit unity; the orchestra has scarcely a bar that is not developed from

---

answers Schindelmeisser, who would seem to have found fault with the character of the performance: "A little while back I summoned the Frankfort Schmidt to Zurich, to go through Lohengrin with him, as—after the Leipzig calamity—I should otherwise have scarcely felt disposed to permit the production in Frankfort at present. To my surprise and delight he actually came, and shewed himself bright and intelligent. Consequently, should he really have not succeeded, the reason would rather appear to me to lie in nothing but a want of energy and authority over his company. As to that, of course, I cannot judge." This certainly is *not* the 'ungrateful Never-pleased.'

preceding motives"—you learn on the one hand that the 'composition-draft' itself was of so "entirely different" a nature to those for his earlier works that its author could not play direct from it; on the other, that the instrumentation already lay *in nuce* in this first "unworked out" draft.* So far as concerns the orchestration, then, the second phase differs from the first rather in degree than in kind; whilst a third phase, that of the fair copy, is required before the music stands complete—with exception of the prelude, for certain, where the second phase is skipped. Possibly it is also skipped in the whole of the opening scene, with which Wagner now is busied; in which case the "wild pencil-sketches" would refer to that part of the first draft which still remains for him to elaborate further, let us say from the entry of the Walhall motive onward. One thing they certainly are not, namely a rough-pencilled *full* score, or he would not ask for somebody to put a tidy 'Partitur' *together* for him (*zusammenzuschreiben*).

A month later (Apr. 9) we hear of more "wild sketches," and this time they are definitely connected with the orchestration: "The instrumentation of 'Rheingold' is going forward: now I have got down with the orchestra to Nibelheim. In May the whole will be ready—only no fair copy: all illegibly pencilled on

* In other words, the 'composition' of the earlier operas was more or less conceived in harmonic terms, representable by the pianoforte, with the main colouring to be added in the 'instrumentation' stage; whereas the 'composition' of *Rheingold* and its successors is conceived at once in polyphonic terms, or those of the full orchestra, merely leaving details of combination and elaboration to be focused in the instrumental working-out. The cause of this change of method is obvious: instead of acting as sheer accompaniment, with an occasional characteristic theme to enounce or iterate, the orchestra has now become interpreter of all the inner motives, a running commentary on the scenic drama.—In the absence of any published facsimiles from these later 'composition-drafts' (see 183 *ant.*), the reader will find instruction in Letter 242 of the *Wagner-Liszt Corr.*, where a passage from act ii of *Siegfried* is given in full score, though it has manifestly been but that moment 'composed' (May 30, '57) and the actual scoring of the act is not begun until a decad later. It is not a complex piece of orchestration, for it consists of six thinly-filled staves, including the voice; but the finished score presents the very tiniest variation from this impromptu sketch. If we imagine the passage reduced to a couple of staves and a few "hieroglyphics," and allow an extra stave or two for more exacting situations, we shall probably have a very fair idea of the 'composition-drafts' of the *Ring*.

single sheets; so you won't be able to get a sight of it so soon. In June I must get to the 'Walküre.'" At all events as regards the second scene and onward, therefore, there were the three phases already suggested; and we may take it that the loose "single sheets" of the second phase would not in themselves present a continuous picture of the work, as there would be many a page of the 'composition-draft' that could be very well left to take care of its simpler construction until the mechanical fair-copying eventually came round. In any case, the mode adopted with *Rheingold* not only differs "from before," but also from after, since it differs in its various parts. It was a period of feeling his way along a new road, and the traveller must learn by experience what stride suited best.

While Wagner is scoring the first division of his RING, the world outside is still playing poor jokes with his earlier works. Berlin I reserve for another chapter, as it has become quite a hardy perennial. But barren old Munich has sprouted at last; to the eye. The same letter that announces the completion of the first half of *Rheingold*, reports to Liszt an application: "The Augsburg people have produced Tannhäuser [March 8], sufficiently badly! That has broken ground for Munich: Dingelstedt has written me most amiably, and so aroused my confidence that I have had the opera sent him, since it is to be given in the summer."* The only question in Wagner's mind just now is that of payment: he would prefer royalties, with an immediate deposit on account—as he tells Liszt; if it is to be a fee for good and all, however, "Dresden always paid me 60 louis; but as Tannhäuser has proved itself an exchequer-filler everywhere, I shouldn't think 100 too much to ask as a lump sum from so big a court-theatre." Liszt is to write and use his influence with D.; which he does Apr. 14. But Liszt's opinion, that "Dingelstedt is a *gentleman*, and will certainly behave in a manner to content you," is scarcely borne out by events; for D.

* N.B. This is the man "constitutionally suspicious of everybody"; but perhaps the "confidence" is more than half a relaxation of the author's former intransigence. As to Dingelstedt, on the other hand, the reader will remember him from vol. iii (pp. 60-2) as the writer of a half-and-half review of the *Lohengrin* production at Weimar, and the future ouster of Liszt from his position at that theatre.

has not yet answered Wagner by May 2, when the latter mildly supposes that the former "may be experiencing some difficulty; people are too unaccustomed to paying decently for dramatic works. Neither have I any idea as yet, how to get X there [Lachner] out of the way, for Tannhäuser. . . . The tenor, Härtiger, is a good fellow and quite taken with his task; but he himself has said that he cannot see how X, even with the most honourable will, could do justice to such music. One could hardly ask *you*, I suppose, to drop on this philistine nest of wasps as well?"

How far Intendant Dingelstedt was himself to blame, is not easy to judge, but his excuses of Apr. 29 to Liszt are decidedly lame:—"My intention to bring out *Tannhäuser* this summer has become known too soon, apparently through indiscreet friends of Wagner's. Obstacles are consequently placed in my path which I shall need time to surmount, if they are surmountable at all. You know Wagner's unfortunate position; I shall have all conceivable trouble in carrying the matter through whatever, whilst it appears downright impossible to get concessions made him in the matter of honorarium, etc., which transcend the measure of our precepts. So, for all my sincere sympathy with Wagner's lot, I see myself incapable of helping him in his present embarrassment. Nevertheless, I will not only take direct steps for his opera with His Majesty the King that I would not take for anybody in the world, as they are hazardous in every respect, but will also do my best to smooth his path within our theatre. I will write him so soon as I find a quiet hour; meanwhile convey him my greetings, and admonish him to—patience. Who needs it more, than a German tone-poet? At most a German Theatre-intendant!"

Methinks the gentleman doth protest too much. Certainly Dingelstedt had written Liszt last September, "I must have a talk with you about Tannhäuser; it ought to come out in March 1854. Will you ask Wagner, in my name, to tell me his requirements etc.? But it must remain a secret among ourselves; our new conductor, who enters office in January, is to make this work his test-piece, and the whole thing is to come as a surprise before anyone has had time to think of manœuvring against it." All very well; but the "secret" had become public property long before D.'s recent negotia-

tions, since the *N. Zft* of Feb. 3, '54, says "It had been reported by several journals that Wagner's 'Tannhäuser' was to be produced at Munich. 'South-German musical conditions,'* however, seem to have triumphed over Dingelstedt's else so good intention; the news is recalled. Nevertheless we shall continue to hope that Dingelstedt will eventually emancipate himself from those fetters." As that was a good two months before the Intendant's "most amiable" letter to Wagner, it is nonsense to prate of the plan having *since* been frustrated by premature publicity, or of the need of taking special steps to influence King Maximilian: surely the Intendant had greater authority in his own theatre than a mere Kapellmeister who had lately been promoted to the nominal rank of Generalmusikdirector, Franz Lachner! Moreover, as D. has "only yesterday returned from a long official journey" which he had already commenced when Wagner first wrote Liszt on the matter (Apr. 9), he can scarcely have had time, among his other arrears of work, to ascertain how "insurmountable" was the alleged obstacle at court. Neither could the question of fee etc. have been the insurmountable obstacle, as Wagner had made no manner of stipulation: "I conjured him to get me the best possible terms, as my operas were my only capital and of necessity I counted largely on the big court-theatres. For the rest, I set up no conditions, as I trust him" (to L., Apr. 9). No: Dingelstedt had evidently been cooled down, not only by Lachner's opposition, but also by his trip to *Berlin* and Vienna; and his sincerity may be inferred from the simple fact that, even with a literary-minded Intendant, the copies of the *Tannhäuser* brochure despatched to the Munich theatre were never so much as cut (iii, 371).† The opera had to wait there till August 1855: another instance of the inscrutable ways of "big court-theatres."

---

* See Bülow's articles on "The Opposition in South Germany" in the *N. Zft* of Nov. 25, Dec. 2, 9, 16 and 23, 1853, where the "scandal" of Lachner's murdering of the *Tannh.* overture Nov. 1, 1852, is specially shewn up (Dec. 2, '53).

† See also Letter 38 to Fischer: "Please send 'Tannhäuser' to *Munich* at once; I have come to agreement with Dingelstedt. Add *six* copies of the brochure. Meser ought to write at once about the textbooks.—As regards scenarium and sketches I have referred to you." This undated letter is

From the outer, let us turn for a moment to the inner side of Wagner's life during the scoring of *Rheingold*.

Seeing how continually Liszt is asked to do so much for him, we have singular marks of our hero's fearlessness of spirit—the vulgar may call it ingratitude—in his communion with his friend and benefactor. Thus the letter of March 4 begins: "Many thanks for your 'Künstler.'* With me you had much against this composition—I mean, no mood for it. . . . Imagine all the opposition you perforce aroused in me through the very choice of poem! This is more or less didactic verse: the philosopher returning to art at last, and doing it with utmost emphasis on his resolve. Schiller to the life!—Then, a concert chorus—: I've no more taste for such a thing, and at no price could I make it; I shouldn't know whence to draw my inspiration.—And yet another point. My musical attitude toward word-verse has immensely altered," and so on, with the remarks about "melody that doesn't consent to flow" and "harmonic freaks" contrasted with the natural simplicity of his *Rheingold* modulations (179 *ant.*). "Conceive for yourself, then, how sensitive I am just now on all these points, and how I necessarily winced when, on opening your 'Künstler,' I was faced at once with the direct opposite of my *present* procedure! I won't deny that it was with shaking of the head I travelled on, and stupidly had an eye for nothing at first but what estranged me, i.e. details, and again details. Nevertheless there was many a one of those details that plucked me out of my huff; so I shook myself up at the close, and hit on the sensible notion of letting the *whole* now pass before me in due swing—and then it passed happily *into* me! Of a sudden I saw you at your conductor's-desk—saw, heard, and understood you. Thus I obtained fresh proof of the experience that it is *our* fault alone, if we are unable to receive anything a high heart has given us.

---

printed between one of Jan. 21, '55, and another of March 2, '55; but it most certainly belongs to April '54, since Wagner's to Liszt of the 9th of that month, as we have just seen, distinctly states "I have had the opera sent him" (*ich habe ihm die Oper zuschicken lassen, die nun im Sommer dort gegeben werden soll*).

* The form in which Liszt's *An die Künstler* was sent to Wagner was the 'autographed' score of 1853, for male choir and octet, with "harmonic accompaniment" as performed at the Carlsruhe festival (165 *ant.*). In 1857 Liszt *revised* and instrumented it. A detailed analysis will be found in the third volume of L. Ramann's *Franz Liszt* (pp. 138-43).

This call of yours to Artists is a great, a beautiful and glorious page from your own artist-life," and so on. All the blame is recalled by another half-column of praise. But, out of diplomatic regard for a friend's susceptibilities, there are few who would not have totally suppressed the previous criticism at such a juncture, or would have wound up the discussion with "So—thanks for the 'Künstler': to me it is as if you had made it as a present for *me* alone, and no one else would discover what you have therewith made a present to the world!"

The second instance of Wagner's outspokenness is still more singular. In the letter of Apr. 9 he is imploring Liszt to be less reticent about his own worries: "I feel hurt at your always touching them so cursorily. From all I gather, I can but fear that the princess has been deprived of her estates completely and for ever; and I must confess that such losses well may stagger one. I comprehend that you are looking to the future with a heavy heart, as with this fate is also bound that of a most lovable young person.—Yet, were you to tell me that you three dear ones were now quite bereft of possessions and alone in the world—so foolish am I that I could not be deeply afflicted, particularly if I saw that you still preserved your courage." Considering that this selfsame letter has just asked Liszt to try and secure the writer a respectable fee for an opera, these words may sound peculiar: for that very reason we may be sure they were dictated by the reverse of lack of sympathy. May not Wagner have dreaded the danger to Liszt of over-large possessions, such as he would have been burdened with by marriage to a great landed proprietress? For his own personal interests, nothing could have been more likely to smooth his path than a wealthy Liszt; but would it have been good for Liszt himself in the long run? As we know (vol. iii), Princess Wittgenstein was *not* reduced to anything approaching penury by all her Russian persecutions; but might not Liszt's own future have shaped better, had it not been hampered by the trappings of a semi-grandee? That clearly is at bottom of this strange condolence. The princess had daily greeted Liszt with "Nicht Gut, nicht Gold . . . lässt die Liebe nur sein!"—and Wagner simply takes them at their word.* For he continues:

* Certainly P^ss^ Carolyne was not offended by it, since we find her writing Wagner three months later (no. 163 *W.-L.*) begging for more of these "golden pieces."

"Ah dearest, dearest Franz! Give me a heart, a mind, a woman's soul, in which I might *wholly* merge myself, that would embrace the whole of me—how little I then should ask of this world: how indifferent would all this trumpery appear to me that despair of late beguiled me to gather around me again as if for fantastic distraction!!—My God! if I only could live with *you three* in beautiful retirement; if we could belong to one another here—how? 'twould be quite immaterial—instead of frittering ourselves away on so many coxcombs and ignoramuses*—how happy I should feel!—and 'off and on' we'd soon take a thing or two in hand to give us an outer vent as well.—But I'm wool-gathering. Send me to the right-about, as I deserve:—nobody will ever make anything of me but a fantastic fool!"

It is not the recklessness of impecuniosity, that makes our hero talk like this; neither is it a dog-in-the-manger mood, or fox and sour grapes. A year ago, just when his prospects seemed so good that he had moved into more commodious quarters and begun surrounding himself with what he now curses as "trumpery"; a year ago he had written Liszt, "Can't you come in May? On the 22nd I shall be—40 years old. That day I will get myself baptised again: haven't you a mind to be godfather?—Then I should like *us both* to make this place our starting-point, and go into the wide world! You too must leave these German philistines and Jews: have you aught else around you? Add Jesuits, and your list is complete! 'Philistines, Jews and Jesuits'—but never a human being! . . . Let them go; give them a kick with your foot, and come forth with me into the wide world: were it but to go clean under, there, to founder cheerfully in some abyss!" The obverse of his passionate demand for "life," this inner longing to be quit of it that comes out so often in his correspondence long ere Schopenhauer has preached it to him.

Something similar must have appeared in the unpublished portion of his next letter (dateable about the 20th of April '54), which Liszt receives in the act of answering that of April 9, and

* It is only right to remark, that, besides the "Laffen und Unverständnissvolle"—which we may interpret as tufthunters and tufthunted—Liszt had the most active intercourse with some of the best artists of his day, in every branch, and was never tired of befriending those of them who asked him for a service; but he was so reticent as to his own doings, that Wagner had scarcely a notion of this other side of the 'man of the world.'

characterises with "What a woeful, doleful wail again!—To help, or look passively on—both are almost equally impossible to me." In the part of this letter of Wagner's that *has* been given us, we read: "Do you think it would be of any use if I sent you a letter to the King of Saxony, which the Grand Duke of Weimar might convey to him through some confidential person (perhaps his ambassador)? I admit, the Saxon *Minister* [Beust] would be more important than the King; but I cannot possibly apply to such a man. Would the Grand Duke do it?—Something must come to pass with me now,—I must be able to escape from my ordinary state at least 'off and on'; otherwise — —." Presumably the desperation is largely due to domestic jars, if we bear in mind the cry for "a woman's soul" in the preceding letter; but the momentary revival of the desire for amnesty perhaps is traceable to another remark in that letter: "Schindelmeisser wrote me yesterday, begging me to come privily to Darmstadt, as *Lohengrin* on the second day of Easter [Apr. 17] would be splendid" (see Appendix).

Liszt sensibly answers: "After the experiences I have made (of which I have told you only the smaller part) I can scarcely imagine that the King of Saxony will take the step of clemency we wish. Nevertheless I will make another trial. Send me your letter to his Majesty" etc. But Wagner has put a curb on himself by the time this reaches him, for he writes May 2: "I can never breathe complaint to you again: I sin too shamefully against you by my confidences, whereas you keep your troubles to yourself . . . Today I've but one trouble left, and that is your great concealment of your own straits from my compassion. Can you really feel too superior toward me; or is it that you refuse to pay me back the painful impression my cries have made upon you in your powerlessness to help me? Dear friend, so be it! If you really feel no need to pour forth all your heart for once, stay dumb! But should you ever feel that need, then hold me also worthy to be cried to! . . . Assume from now that everything is straight with me: let no other care assail you for me, than that which my distress about yourself inspires in you!—The letter to the King of Saxony I shall leave nicely unpenned: for that matter, I should not have known what *truth* to write in it that he could understand—and I don't want to *lie:* indeed it is the solitary sin I know!—I shall polish off my Nibelungen: 't will be

time enough then, to take a look around the world again.—I'm sorry for *Lohengrin;* it will probably go to the dogs meanwhile. Let it: I have still something else in my bag!—So I've been plaguing you unneedfully once more."

That brings us back to *Das Rheingold;* which we really must see finished, or this chapter will never end.

Liszt had acquainted the composer with the difficulty of finding such a "secretary" as he had previously asked for, to do the compilatory fair-copying: "I have had inquiries made of one of my former friends in Berlin, however, to see if he could make himself disposable." But this letter of May 2 replies: "I shall be obliged, after all, to make the fair copy of my scores myself; it's far too hard to do after *my* intention, especially as the sketches often are hopelessly confused, so that nobody but myself, maybe, could make head or tail of them. 'Twill merely take longer!—Hearty thanks for this care also:—but we'll talk of it another time; perhaps—if it tires me quite too much—I may still have recourse to your Berlin friend. . . . When I'm composing or instrumenting, I always think solely of *you*, how this or that will please you: *I always* have you in my mind."

This confirms what I have already surmised about the "loose sheets": for the composer they constituted (*with* the 'composition-draft') a finished whole, but he alone possessed the key to fit the scattered parts together. Some pages would be nothing but a scribbled mass of symbols, or perhaps the detailed figuring of the predominant instrumental factor in a given situation; whilst others, the more important passages, would perhaps be carefully mapped out already. To the latter category we may reasonably assign the closing tableau, as Wagner is so engrossed in the latter end of his task that he can barely spare an instant for urgent correspondence. May 26 he sends Liszt half-a-dozen lines, beginning: "In a day or two I will write you at length, and also explain why I'm writing so briefly to-day." May 27 old Fischer is also given half-a-dozen: "In a day or two I shall have ended my first score since ever so long (Das Rheingold); latterly my fanaticism for work has been so great, that I have deferred all letter-writing until after the completion. So look forward to a decent letter soon," etc. **May 28 the instrumentation is finished,** all but its fair-copy; and Wagner writes Liszt ten days later, "I'm trying to vegetate a little now. The fair-

copying of the score of 'Rheingold' I must still let wait. The next thing will be, to have a shot at 'die Walküre!'"

It was six years since a score of his, the score of *Lohengrin*, had seen its close; yet the present work has taken considerably less time than its predecessor—not quite seven months from the first note of the composition-draft to the last chord of the full orchestration. Possibly it would have been better, had the instrumenting occupied him a little longer, as there certainly are places where the 'flats do not quite join,' to adopt a theatrical term; where the composer, in his ardour to avoid all padding, has not made all conceivable use of his immense wealth of thematic material. More musical interest might easily have been conferred on the two long scenes with the Giants, for instance, and surely would have been a few years hence; whilst even in that final tableau, where the scoring mounts to 42 staves including the 12 for the harps, there is not that infinity of perspective we get in the maturer works with fewer staves, for many of the instruments are scored in unison, though the six harps themselves are treated with a magical variety of effect. But this was the *earliest* composition since its author had consciously struck his new path, and it would be absurd to expect the new procedure to be perfect in all points at once. On the other hand, see the enormous leap that has been taken since *Lohengrin:* only here and there do you catch an echo of the older style of declamation, whereas each separate 'motive' is as if chiselled out of granite. Between no two consecutive works of Wagner's, except perhaps *Rienzi* and the *Dutchman*, is there a greater contrast. In fact, the *Rheingold* music stands almost as a thing apart, at once a boundary- and a foundation-stone. Here the general impression is that of austerity and rugged strength, as befits a plinth; an impression fostered by that great simplicity of the harmonic scheme on which the composer himself has laid stress (179-81 *ant.*). Trenchancy of rhythm and sobriety of modulation—these are the distinctive features of the music of the Prologue to the RING. Subtlety is to appear in train of the more complex passions of the later nights: here the passages of richer orchestration are almost confined to landscape-painting. Yet with all the ruggedness there is no blare. What other musician would have kept his gorgeous Walhall-motive consistently *piano* or *mezzo-forte*, even when Wotan greets the

glowing battlements with "In prächtiger Gluth prangt glänzend die Burg," reserving his fortissimo until the Gods are actually approaching them? If noise there ever is at a performance of *Rheingold*, it is due to the incompetence or effrontery of conductors who ignore the clearest indications of a musician than whom none knew better the virtue of restraint. When he multiplied his instruments, it was mostly with the view to obtaining a smooth and mellow, instead of a scrannel-pipe *piano;* the inevitable waverings of slackened breath or arm were to neutralise each other and thus produce a gently even wave, in lieu of a broken gasp. If you desire a simple illustration, you may find it in the difference between a note struck lightly on a trichord grand and that on the old bichord upright: you are able to produce an absolutely softer sound, though your reserve of power is so much greater.

So *Das Rheingold* is finished, "But you'll get no sight of it before it is decently dressed; and that can only be in leisure hours and long winter evenings, for I cannot be delayed with it now — the Walküre is thrilling finely through my every limb," Liszt hears mid-June. "Seek me no amanuensis. Mme Wesendonck has presented me with a gold pen—of indestructible writing-power—which is turning me into a caligraphic pedant again. The scores will be my most consummate masterpiece of penmanship. One can't escape one's destiny! Meyerbeer admired nothing so much in my scores, in days gone by, as the tidy writing: that praise has become my curse:—I *must* write tidy scores throughout my earthly life."

The tribute thus jokingly recalled we have already heard from another master: now let us have a pupil's testimony. June 29 Hans v. Bülow writes Liszt: "Wagner is so good as to give me news of himself from time to time. He has promised to send me his first opera of the 'Nibelungen'—that I may make the pianoforte score—as soon as he shall have written the fair copy." Not for another couple of months can Hans have received any portion of the score—i.e. till there came a lull in the composition of *Die Walküre*—and then for the immediate purpose of getting a duplicate made in Dresden, so as to leave the original at liberty while he was working out the transposition. Finally he receives the last instalment of the fair copy, completed by Wagner's own hand

Sept. 26, '54, and writes Liszt Oct. 6 : "In sending me the last portion of his *Rheingold* score, only a few days since, Wagner charged me to let you have the entire work without too much delay : it is such a chef d'œuvre of caligraphy, that it might be admitted in that capacity to an exhibition."

In what frame of mind Liszt received the priceless loan, we shall learn in due course. For the close of our present chapter we will return to Wagner's letter of mid-June :—

Heralded with a symbol, "Let night come—I look above—for *me*, too, shines my star," the composition of the *Rheingold* music had for its pursuivant "Old Night has me again." After its scoring is finished, to usher in *Die Walküre* we meet another symbol : "As for 'success,' in a practical sense, probably I shall never have it. 'Twould be too keen an irony on my situation and nature. On the other hand, I feel ready and glad to die at any moment—smiling—if only a noble occasion appeared.—What would one more?—Truly—so far as concerns my purely personal future—I wish for nothing but a right seemly death, since life indeed has a hitch in it : my only regret, at times, is that everything around me stays so void of cause for that. Everything trends to a long 'long life,' however lean and thin and shabby it fall out. Heigh-ho !! . . . I can write no more—'tis no use trying—even with the golden pen.—Much could I *say*, if tears did not haply overcome me, as erewhile in the railway-carriage.—I have just been called away : an eagle was flying over the house !—A good omen !

"'Long live the eagle'—gloriously he flew—the swallows were greatly embarrassed. Farewell, in the sign of the eagle !"

VI.

—— HOLLANDAISE.

Carolyszt again: the Holländer *essay; a re-editress.—Pss Wittgenstein as predominant partner: forced analogy with Balzac; purple patches and poetic insight.—Wagner unenlightened as to the collaboration.—The Erik blot; psychology shallow and deep; a woman's intuition.—Wagner still left in the dark.—Liszt's true share in the essay.—A question of history; Weimar confusion of scores; "this* momentous *change" in close of overture.—The essay's influence.*

Läss'st du von deiner Schwärmerei wohl ab?
HOLLÄNDER act ii.

BETWEEN completion of the *Rheingold* orchestration and commencement of the music for *Die Walküre* a month elapses. I propose to take advantage of that interval for an excursion beyond the walls of Zurich, since two outside events of some importance are foreshadowed in a letter reaching Wagner just as his Gods are constructing their rainbow-bridge.

May 20, 1854, Liszt forwards him the beginning of a correspondence with Hülsen, at the same time remarking: "I still am rather weary and unwell. Letter-writing and negotiating I detest—for relaxation I am working at a longish essay on the Flying Dutchman. Let us hope it will amuse you. Brendel will take it up complete by the middle of June—meanwhile it will appear * as a feuilleton in the Weimar official Gazette." Reserving the subject of that correspondence with the Berlin Intendant for

* "Einstweilen erscheint er"—by an idiomatic use of the present tense, not frequent with ourselves, the Germans often signify the future. In that sense I interpret this "erscheint" on account of later allusions. When, or in fact whether, the *Dutchman* "feuilleton" appeared in the "Weymar'sche offizielle Zeitung," I cannot say, as minor foreign journals are not preserved in our Museum, and even Liszt's biographers are hazy on the point.

a separate chapter, I shall devote the present to this longest, virtually the last, of the Altenburg Wagnerian essays.

Sainte-Beuve to Liszt, March 31, 1850: "You cannot doubt that I should have been delighted to do the small revision you wished, if it had been materially possible to me . . . but I cannot spare a single instant. After casting a glance on your interesting and generous appreciation, it seems to me that, to give it French form, as I understand the term, it would have been necessary to take the whole work to pieces and rewrite it; a task I was incapable of applying myself to, for the moment." That from a master-critic of style, presumably referring to the original French manuscript of the *Vie de Chopin;* which we know to have been the work of 'Carolyszt,' though it bears Liszt's name alone and misled even his intimate Stahr into writing about "thy 'Chopin'" and "*one* spirit pervading the whole book" (June '52).

Liszt to Brendel, March 18, '54: "Herewith an article that may suit your paper. Euryanthe, which I conduct here tomorrow, forms its occasion—yet it broaches a more general question . . . At first I started with an introductory line or two, which I now strike out. Perhaps you will be so kind, yourself, as to introduce me in a few words to the '*neue Zeitschrift.*' The devising of this little prelude will come best from you. My name with its five letters can be frankly announced, as I am quite prepared to stand by my opinion."* And to Köhler, a few weeks later: "I am very glad you liked my article on Euryanthe and theatre-management, and thank you most sincerely for your warm and truly welcome letter. For some weeks I have been following your example (since you always set a good one to myself and others) and publishing sundry views on art affairs and works in the Weimar

* The article on "Weber's Euryanthe: von Franz Liszt" duly appeared in the *N. Z.* of March 24, '54, with the following footnote by Brendel: "It affords us great pleasure to be able to inform our readers that Hr. Dr. Liszt herewith commences to fulfil our wish, already frequently expressed to him, that he would take part in this journal as contributor. The immediate task he has set himself, is to connect general observations with a report on the operas given during the last season at Weimar, as also to speak on the procedure desirable for theatrical managers to adopt in their regard. Euryanthe, the last to be mounted, supplies him with the first connecting-point.—The Ed."

official Gazette. Probably these articles will mount by degrees to a volume, which will then have to include the whole set."

Liszt to Carolyne, during a brief absence at Gotha, where he is rehearsing the Duke's opera, end of March '54: "I beg you 300 million times, do not be cross—but the article on *Egmont* [Beethoven's music] must not appear before my return to Weymar, as I still have several big and many minor observations to make in its regard. Every subject that touches on Goethe is dangerous for me to treat. Nevertheless, by keeping to the point of view of the union of drama with music, one may get over that—only, to my mind, one must restrict oneself thereto, and not commence by systematically broaching the question of the intellectual and moral progress of musicians since the advent of Jesus Christ. Not that this question is not sufficiently allied to the other, but it is good to remember that verse of Boileau's, 'Qui ne sait se borner, ne sut jamais écrire,' in these sorts of cases."

Bülow to Liszt, end of April '54: "I shall soon send you the article of Mme la Princesse Wittgenstein which I have translated for Brendel. Regarding the signature, I have been obliged to invent one, as I had an intimate conviction that you were not the author of this polemic." Shrewd Hans, but an imprudent peep behind "the manuscript the Princess sent me for translation"—evidently some member of the series mentioned above, no matter which, as most of them appeared first in the Weimar journal and immediately thereafter in Brendel's *N. Z.*

Not one of these quotations is directly concerned with the *Holländer* essay; indirectly they all are, profoundly. Bülow alone seems to have guessed the truth, though his suspicions must have soon been allayed when he found his conscientious pseudonym replaced by those magical "five letters." Liszt, however, had dwelt long in Paris, where a Dumas père gave his name to works still less his own; and even in our virtuous London the 'ghosts' are beginning to unfold strange tales of stranger tales they merely get consent to add a well-known author's name to, or of more serious tracts they write to order of some celebrity in other fields. Still—Wagner at least should have been let into the secret, if only to enable him to distribute his compliments fairly.

No more than in the case of *Lohengrin et Tannhäuser*, have we

to rely on supposition for the authorship of the *Holländer* analysis. Last volume (p. 190) we heard Liszt's chosen editress relate: "In the essay on the *Flying Dutchman*, among others, many an analogy with poetry and the plastic arts was 'touched in' by the Princess, to quote an expression used [in the seventies?] by Liszt himself." But we have evidence from the very year of composition: in a letter of July 17, '54, Liszt speaks to Carolyne of "nos fatrasies sur le *fliegenden Holländer*"—rather cutting, that "our flummery." A double authorship is thus proved for the French original (unpublished); but a third, and yet again, a fourth hand is engaged for the German version. In the chapter just cited from her *Franz Liszt* (3rd vol., p. 113) Frl. Lina Ramann tells us in respect of Carolyszt's contributions to the *Neue Zeitschrift* in general: "Peter Cornelius seems to have furnished most of the translations into German in those days.* Admirable as was the reproduction of the thought, on the whole, and uneffaced the poetry of expression, [as was to be expected] with *Cornelius'* poetic talent, yet there clung to the work not only the change of tongue, but also a hurry that allowed neither file nor what one might call 'maturing in bond,' not to mention many other factors that lay in the period itself and affected the original text. Then, keen on the immediate moment, there remained no time either for choice or testing of expression. Many a thing, moreover, was not as yet historically fermented out" (*ausgegoren*—whatever that may mean in this connection).

From the directress of a pianoforte-school at Nuremberg, with a literary style by no means parodied above, this condescension to the poet-composer Cornelius is delicious; more particularly as a previous paragraph informs us that the MSS. of *none* of these

* As regards the next batch of articles Liszt writes Brendel, in fact, Nov. '54: "Cornelius has been somewhat indisposed the last few days, and that has delayed the translation"; to which La Mara (editress of all Liszt's *letters* other than to Wagner) adds a note: "Peter Cornelius translated for the *Neue Zeitschrift* the articles now published in [Liszt's] 'Gesammelte Schriften' vols. III. to V.; they were written by Liszt—with multifarious collaboration of the Princess Wittgenstein—in the French language." Cornelius must have replaced Bülow in the said useful capacity about May '54, just before the *Holländer* essay was begun; for Liszt writes Brendel Apr. 26, "Your commissions to Cornelius have been attended to," and to A. Rubinstein July 31, "I again recommend Cornelius for the translation of your opera; but it will be necessary for you to spend a few weeks here, to expedite the affair."

articles were obtainable by her, and consequently she was in no position to judge whether they had lost or gained by efforts of her male forerunner which she arbitrarily assumes to have been scamped—*schnell verlangte Arbeit.* But in 1875 Liszt had let himself be talked by Frl. Ramann into permitting her to prepare a Complete Collection of his writings, and in 1880-83 they were issued in six volumes,* all edited by this well-meaning lady, and all by herself retouched with exception of the *Chopin*, of which the daintier-winged La Mara had taken care. Thus from beginning to end—for we may reasonably suspect "Daniel Sterne" of a finger in those of the thirties—were the spinnings of Liszt's pen spread out on crinoline, whilst one of the latest figurantes in the scarf-dance has stripped them of their last shred of real "historic" value, except for students who can still consult the original issues of the *Neue Zeitschrift* and similar publications.

Frl. Ramann's amazing ideas of the duties of an "historical" editor are set forth by herself, in continuation of the passage last quoted:—

Now, with a Collected Edition, other viewpoints came into play than those of the path-breaking epoch of combat. If on the one hand it was advisable to expunge from these writings the traces of the moment, and, while preserving the author's individual phraseology, of the French idiom, to bring them nearer to the spirit of the German tongue and thereby incorporate them in German literature; on the other it was a question of giving them through the meantime-won clearing of the situation a sharper definition, more pointed expression (*verschärften Ausdruck*, *Zuspitzung der Gedanken*) etc., without robbing them of the characteristic stamp of that epoch, or entirely transforming them as had been the case with the second edition of the 'Chopin' and especially of the '*Bohémiens*'—it was a question of doing one's utmost that the *German* edition should not only be authentic (*rechtmässig*) but at the same time replace the lost originals under the assumption of a recent revision, and might be offered to the future as in some sort an *original issue.* For, into whatever language *Liszt's* essays may be rendered in times to come, it will always be

* Nominally; really seven, as Breitkopf and Härtel have an atrocious habit of splitting a volume into two, e.g. "III. i" and "III. ii."—There is no preface, or bibliographic note of any kind, to *these* "Gesammelte Schriften"; but the facts given above were at last divulged by Frl. Ramann herself, seven years after Liszt's death, in the same passage of her biography ("II. ii," cap. VIII.) on which I have drawn for the two cognate quotations.

this German edition, submitted to the author's eye and probation, and raised by him to legitimacy, that must supply the archetype.

Nothing less than a battery of notes of exclamation could convey one's astonishment at such a programme, and one can only conclude that its victim, Liszt, had a different idea of authorship from that of ordinary mortals (derived from Wagner's "*communistic* artwork"?). Even when a literary man himself makes changes in subsequent editions of his earlier works, it is not always either to their advantage or to his readers' taste, and rather exemplifies a certain pose; but to give carte blanche to a comparative stranger to undertake the task, subject merely to a casual glance before the proofs are passed, is to strike at the roots of all "historic" conscience. Moreover, these volumes are professedly "translated into German" (see their title-pages), whereas the editress and self-styled translator here avows that only in a minority of instances were the French originals at her disposal.* They *are* translated, though—from fluent German into crabbed, as we have seen with the *Lohengrin* essay. Not even a quotation from Wagner's own *Remarks on the Flying Dutchman*, plainly acknowledged in the context, can this schoolmarm leave unmaimed by her craving to enrich "German literature." Those *Remarks* had not been published at the time the Carolysztian essay made its first appearance, but are specifically referred to there as "a little writing which he [W.] addresses to stage-managers." It is therefore possible that a subsidiary word or two may have been added or omitted when the *Remarks* at last were issued to the public in vol. v of Wagner's *Ges. Schr.* (cf. *P.* III.). At any rate, the form of the passage quoted in the *Neue Zeitschrift* differs in two or three small details from that of 1872: the former begins with "Das ganze Benehmen des Holländers zeigt stille" &c., the latter with "Sein ganzes Benehmen zeigt hier stille" &c.; another "hier wie" is absent from the *N. Z.* version, as also is a clause, "nach dem furchtbaren Ausbruche . . . spricht er seine Sehnsucht nach Ruhe aus"; whereas the pronoun "seiner" here stands before "Antworten," and "so oft als vergebens erkannten!" represents "(so oft als einen vergebenen erkannten)." With

* Namely the works that had already been *published* either in both languages or in the French alone.

exception of the omitted clause—in all likelihood omitted 54 for brevity sake—the difference is infinitesimal, whether due to Cornelius or to the later Wagner. But turn to Frl. Ramann's version! From such a declared stickler for preservation of an "author's individual phraseology" one would have expected some verifying of this quotation, the source whereof was then so easily accessible. Oh dear no: the *N. Z.* variants are retained, and far more serious variants added at discretion; twice is a clumsy "und" thrust in, to replace a semicolon—a favourite lâche of the prolix; that "vergebens" is wilfully turned into "trügerisch"; "wie mit kramphafter Hast" becomes "mit einer kramphaften Hast" (quite the English governess); Wagner's "Alles, auch die scheinbar absichtlichsten Antworten und Fragen, geschieht wie unwillkürlich," is degraded to "Alle Momente, auch die scheinbar absichtlichsten seiner Antworten und Fragen, ergeben sich wie unwillkürlich," notwithstanding that the same sentence, in all versions, ends with an "ergiebt" in its truer sense; and Wagner's "die enthusiastische Antwort Daland's: 'Fürwahr, ein *treues* Kind!' reisst ihn dann plötzlich aber wieder" &c. degenerates into "Als aber Daland enthusiastisch antwortet: 'Fürwahr, ein treues Kind!' reisst es ihn plötzlich" &c.—where the "enthusiastisch antwortet" is altogether terrible. All this within a dozen lines! Rank impertinence, one would feel disposed to dub it, were it not more likely to have sprung from ignorance that the passage in the *N. Z.* essay was a quotation at all;* since the long excerpts from the *Holländer* text itself, strewn broadcast through that Carolysztian essay, are mercifully left as far as ever from Fräulein Ramann's standard for "the spirit of the German tongue."

---

* L. Ramann's method here plays her quite a nasty trick. Had she been modestly content with Cornelius' "So schildert Wagner selbst seine inneren Bewegungen und ihre Darstellung in diesem Zusammentreffen," all would have been well. One might even have welcomed a substitution of "des Holländers" for "seine," to avoid any ambiguity, making the sentence read, "Thus Wagner himself describes the Holländer's inner emotions, and their portrayal in this encounter." But it did not satisfy the preciosity of L. R.; she altered it, and, altering it, unconsciously betrayed two facts: the one, that she did not always *understand* the author she had set out to emend; the other, that she was unaware of the printed existence of that "little writing" to which he refers but seven lines later. For this is her version: "So schildert und bringt *Wagner* selbst die innersten Erregungen in diesem Zusammen-

If the above shews that Liszt in the eighties can scarcely have bestowed much "probation" on his editress' handiwork, my next examples will prove how little memory he treasured of his first translators. Fortunate indeed had he been in the fifties, to secure the services of two such stylists as Bülow and Cornelius.* He now delivers them, bound hand and foot, to the caprices of a renovator; and they emerge from the process with all the difference between a new pair of gloves and one French-cleaned at a small German shop without the skill to chase away the odour of its paraffin. Poor Liszt; poor princess; poor Cornelius! (Poor Bülow, too; but in *this* case he is not of the party). In one of his posthumously-published jottings Wagner says: "One would write not only correctly, but in a certain sense poetically, if with every metaphor one strictly abode by the concrete meaning of the principal word, now abstractly employed, in all the epithets appended to it"—a canon of 'style' no literary person, however negligent to follow, will readily dispute. What, then, shall be said to the studied conversion of Cornelius' "gehen hier fortwährend Hand in Hand" into "gehen hier beständig Hand in Hand"? Both adverbial terms express continuance, true enough; but in her mania for interference L. R. arrests the march of her forerunner's "go" by a qualification derived from "stand." A small point, no doubt, yet characteristic of the whole revision. Cornelius *had* that poetic sense defined by Wagner; Miss Ramann, professedly translating de novo,† annexes his product en masse, but

---

treffen zum Ausdruck"—*angl.* "Thus Wagner describes and brings to expression in this encounter even the inmost agitations" (shake it up how you will, it makes no better sense); where the "description" is transferred from an ignored quotation to the scene itself. Hence it is clear that the collective title of *Wagner's* "Gesammelte Schriften" was their only feature familiar to the latest chaperon of Liszt.

* Of Cornelius' translation of *L'Enfance du Christ* Berlioz himself says: "On me dit que la traduction allemande est très bien faite et je te prie de remercier très particulièrement mon exact et spirituel traducteur" (to Liszt, Nov. 14, '54).

† 'Ex nihilo' would perhaps be more correct, as this lady had no 'original' to work from: 'spontaneous' translation? The title-page of her aforesaid vol. III. ii. bears the words "DRAMATURGISCHE BLÄTTER. II. Abtheilung.—RICHARD WAGNER.—1. Tannhäuser und der Sängerkrieg auf Wartburg. 2. Lohengrin. 3. Der fliegende Holländer. 4. Das Rheingold—von FRANZ LISZT.—Mit Notenbeispielen.—In das Deutsche übertragen von L. RAMANN." May we charitably attribute that description to her publishers, we can hardly

fidgets it into invertebrate prose by transposition of clauses or substitution of a halting word wherever she can : a cross between paraphrase and anagram.

On Cornelius kind Nature had bestowed a musical ear : Frl. Ramann's seems to have been ruined by much lesson-giving, as she needlessly tweaks his " sich in solchem Blut zu reinigen, in solchen Thränen zu baden," for one out of a thousand instances, into " in solchem Blute sich zu reinigen, in solchen Thränen sich zu baden," and dislocates another portion of the same long sentence so cruelly that we obtain the following horror : " die er dort den Morgenwinden anvertraut und als sein Fuss den gastlichen Boden Skandinaviens betrat wiederholt hatte " (*loc. cit.* 215—note the avoidance of commas, leading to a riot of verbs). Cornelius, too, was forced by the very nature of his task to employ a certain number of exotic words ; they give little offence, as his swinging rhythm mostly carries us past them with a rush. From a professing Germanist, who ruthlessly destroys that rhythm, one would have looked for a replacing of those occasional foreignries by words of native root : very rarely is this done. On the contrary, even *unbedingt*, quite a euphonious German participle, is constantly perverted into " absolut " ; " repräsentirt " interlopes ; *Verwünschungen* becomes " grollende Blasphemien " (in a description of the overture !) ; *Vergötterung* struts as " Apotheose," *Antrieb* as " Impuls," *Dunstkreis* as " Atmosphäre," *Bau* as " Architektonik " ; *dies hohe Geheimniss* withers to " dieses hohe Mysterium," *eine Folgerung der vollen Ganzheit* expatriates itself as " eine Konsequenz der Totalität " ; and so on, ad infinitum. For no apparent reason other than sheer love of meddling, the most insignificant clauses are stretched like gutta percha—as when Cornelius's " die immer ferner verhallen " expands, at L. R.'s tug, into " die mehr und mehr in der Ferne verhallen " ; single words or whole sentences unemphasised in the *N. Z.* are blaringly 'spaced,' paragraphs split into two or three fractions regardless of inner cohesion, and commas scamped (against the helpful German

---

so account for the "Verzeichniss der gesammelten Schriften Liszt's" that brings her Liszt-biography to a close (1894), where we find this volume ticked off as " III/2. Band : DRAMATURGISCHE BLÄTTER.—1881—Richard Wagner. (Deutsch von L. R.)—1849—1) Tannhäuser " and so on. Of its contents the first chapter of the *Lohengrin* essay alone had not been previously translated from the French (see my last vol.).

usage) as though Messrs Breitkopf and Härtel had threatened a famine in that class of type. The spirit of dead Cornelius is slain, and former chief-partner Carolyne must have wept hot tears at the over-nice derangement of her periods.*

Even as to the propriety of taking the stock edition of "Franz Liszt's Gesammelte Schriften" as a basis for possible future renderings into other tongues—a modest use claimed for it—I have my doubts. Wishful to see exactly how the *Holländer* essay looked *before* its "historical fermenting out," I have rather carefully collated the greater part of the modern with the original *Neue Zeitschrift* version,† and found not a few bones to pick. Here are a couple, to go on with:—

In the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, after speaking of the dramatic style "evolved by Mozart, Gluck, Beethoven, Spontini, Weber and others," Liszt-Cornelius had remarked that "Wagner is the result of this slow, but constant progress; his works, his very theories, could have been written only by a German and for Germans. The opposition which he has hitherto experienced is founded on transient causes, artificial habits; the sympathies he evokes are essentially German and national" etc. Miss Ramann treats this as an exercise in counterpoint, sharpens her slate-pencil (*Zuspitzung* she herself has called it), scroops in

---

* In a short *Biographie Liszt's*, published by Reclam in the early eighties, Ludwig Nohl († Dec. 1885) thus gave away his critical acumen: "Liszt's literary works, like those of Wagner, form a handsome row of volumes that yield in importance to none by any writer on art, and are an essential complement of our general literature. . . . His style is of a boldness, power, richness, subtlety, that are truly captivating. Even through the lying mask ["Lügengestalt"—cf. *Gtdg*], or at anyrate the beggar's garb of previous translations, 'one single glance of his glittering eye' tells us that here also we have a Siegfried to do with; and one of the translators rightly says: 'Unique, unapproached and unapproachable as Liszt stands in his playing, equally unique and unexampled is he in his style; both are properties of his soul.'" True, Nohl admits a "superabundance of ideas and a riotous luxuriance of fancy"; but a critic unable to detect that this vaunted "style" is not Liszt's at all, is not entitled to disparage that of Cornelius—with a bow to another member of the coterie. Did it never strike these simple souls as somewhat queer, that "Liszt's" essays had ceased the very year the Princess fared from Weimar, whereas her pen continued busy (on other subjects) down to her death in Rome more than a quarter of a century hence?

† Materially assisted by a self-sacrificing friend, who has kindly made copious extracts for me from the *N. Z.*

"artistic, not to say," before the "artificial" of the last sentence, and congeals its predecessor into solid nonsense by deliberately repeating the word "Fortschreiten," among other things; so that we now are edified by the news that "Wagner is the result of this possibly slow, but constant progress; a progress whose works, ay, even its theories could have been evolved and written only by a German and for Germans" (*l.c.* 242). A "progress" possessing works and theories of its own, is sufficiently comic; but we are truly sorry to hear that a wicked German came and stole its works and theories, "evolved and wrote" them on his individual account. It may or may not be correct, thus to diminish Wagner's claim to pioneership; but it was a great liberty to take with Liszt's text, and the 'bull' is a well-deserved penalty.

Almost worse is the havoc wrought in course of Carolyszt's comparison of the subjects of *Tannhäuser*, *Lohengrin* and the *Holländer*, at end of chapter 2. The old *N. Z.* version had: "In *Lohengrin* the author has so lavishly heaped up every conceivable artistic means, has painted with such splendour, and again such noble chasteness of colouring, with such superabundance of truth to life, that the spectator, calmly interested at first, at last forgets himself completely, and lives but in the beings whose destinies he sees fulfilled before his eyes. He does not behold a mirror of his own sufferings, as in *Tannhäuser*, yet is bound to abjure all independence; he is absorbed in the feelings here moving before him," etc. Fräulein Ramann leaves the bulk of the first of these two sentences untouched, simply flattening out a word or so; but—the second! Is it wanton detraction, or mere density, that makes her substitute "*Wagner*" for "Er," i.e. the "spectator" of sentence one? Whichever it be, this is the amazing result: "Although Wagner has here created no mirror of his own sufferings, as in *Tannhäuser*, the hearer must yield himself captive; he is absorbed," and so on. That is to expose entire ignorance of a famous autobiography, the *Communication to my Friends* (first issued 1851-2, reprinted 1872 in *Ges. Schr.* iv), in which the poet identifies his own plight with "that very situation to which I gave artistic effect in the Lohengrin story" (*P.* I. 344). Were it a mere expression of L. R.'s personal opinion, it would not matter one straw; but officiously to *alter* Carolyszt to such a tune! Plainly, Liszt did

not examine the proofs of what are published as his "Collected Writings" with anything remotely approaching a critical eye.

As for the "historic ausgoring," presumably it is confined to other of Miss Ramann's volumes. Right at the beginning of the *Dutchman* essay there were three fair openings for such useful precipitation—by way of footnotes, for choice—but they have all been neglected. By a curious inadvertence, Carolyszt begins a thumb-nail history of the opera's representations with Berlin, places Cassel (Spohr) "later," and nowhere alludes to the city in which the footlights first parted it from its composer. Still more oddly, the joint allusion to Heine's version of the legend exhibits total unacquaintance with his *Salon:* "According to Heine's narrative, a young Norwegian maiden, taught by a popular ballad about that Heavenly promise (*Himmelspruch*) from girlhood up, feels deep sympathy for the hapless captain's fate. One day he lands on the coast of Norway," and so on. In a single sentence three errors of fact. Heine really lays his scene in Scotland, as did Wagner's earliest libretto (see Chamberlain p. 241). Heine says *nothing* of a ballad, but speaks about "a warning handed down with an ancient portrait, namely that the female members of the family must be on their guard against the original." Heine has no taste for "heavenly promises," but makes the Devil himself the author of the saving clause—rather a vital distinction, albeit Carolyszt cannot see that Wagner has effected "any essential alteration in Heine's moving tale."* What a chance for the ausgorer! A trebly un-"historic" statement that had run the gauntlet of Carolyne, Liszt, Cornelius, Brendel, his publisher and his proof-reader. L. Ramann, however, knows her Heine no better than her Wagner; even the world-famed firm of Breitkopf und Härtel, with its army of experts, accords the solecism currency once more.—Alas! it is of a piece with the regret expressed only the other day in Germany's best music-journal, that the Bayreuth management "appears to have banished on principle the becoming and characteristic Dutch caps" from the chorus of (Norwegian) spinning-girls, though the writer never recked the banishment of

* One couldn't without consulting it. A parallel case is that prefatory note to the Weimar *Lohengrin* textbook, which I have at last succeeded in unearthing; see last vol., p. 491, and present Appendix.

Daland's "steersman's" helm.—Let that serve as our step from the sublime to the ridiculous, the third "historic" opening: "It was during a sea-voyage," says the essay of Liszt & Co., "that Wagner read Heine's version of the seamen's legend. The coincidence of the impression of this reading with a violent storm, which he had to endure, begot in one tossed by divers inner storms himself the idea of dramatising the subject." Of course you all know Wagner's own brief lines in the *Autobiographic Sketch* (1843), on which the above is an unintended skit, due to hasty misreading: had any of the various collaborators but thought of turning to the *Communication* (positively cited by Carolyszt in the preceding sentence), they would have discovered that Heine's *Salon* was read by Wagner at Riga, and thus have escaped the absurd implication that he either found this book in the skipper's cabin or had brought it in his trunk to lay the "inner storms" of mal-de-mer. Some sense of humour would have been a priceless boon to most of these good people.

Before saying formal goodbye to the over-zealous L. Ramann, I must specify her one improvement of this essay: with Liszt's permission she has added to it "Notenbeispielen," i.e. musical illustrations, though not invariably in agreement with the context. Always welcome, they were by no means so indispensable in the eighties as a generation earlier, and one is filled with surprise that a musician writing for a musical journal should have neglected so obvious an aid. Even the Leipzig *Illustrirte* had given him a whole big page of music-type in the case of *Lohengrin* three years before, and Brendel could scarcely have refused the request. The article itself declares this opera to be far less widely-known (1854) than either of its successors: here, then, would have been a fine opportunity to introduce its thematic beauties to the mental ear of the musical world, in actuality unapproachable by the most vivid word-painting. Stage-directors are mostly too busy, or too lazy folk, to read a rambling essay and straightway send for the pfte score to verify its eulogies; but who knows that a sprinkling of musical examples, in addition to the lengthy extracts from the text, might not have worked like magic on the circulation of this Cinderella among Wagner's 'three romantic operas'? Surely that was Liszt's main object. But he manifestly had the smaller share in *this* essay's authorship: the predominant partner, not the mere "toucher up," was Princess

Carolyne; and her ambition was to shine in psychological, not musical, analysis.*

Having shewn that the work contained in "Liszt's Collected Writings" is not an absolute replica of the essay Wagner praised so highly, if excessively, on its first appearance—rather a lithograph after an etching—I will run through its earlier history.

With Liszt's first intimation to Wagner, May 20, 1854—fifteen months after the opera's Weimar première †—I opened this chapter. The next we hear is July 7, when together with the announcement of four articles on the *Dame blanche*, Schubert's *Alfonso und Estrella*, Bellini's *Montecchi* and Donizetti's *Favorite*, Brendel is informed that the *Holländer* essay is ready, all but its copying-out—translation?—"a very long one, which will run to several of your issues." A day or two later, Pss Carolyne to Wagner: "Liszt was very happy to hear that his articles in the W. Z. please you. It is like you, to have understood them so well!—They will be continued for a little while. The *fliegende Holländer* will terminate this series. No, it is not a funeral wreath he is binding.—He *lives* and *will live*, your sad and noble hero! Sleep, solitude, these are not death; and his power of vitality is such that in due time he yet will make a long tour of

* A remarkable and intimately biographic article, "Zu Liszts Briefen an die Fürstin Carolyne Sayn-Wittgenstein," published in the *Bayr. Blätter* 1900—unsigned, but furnishing sufficient indications of exceptional authority—openly attributes the whole essay to the princess, when it alludes to "*die Stelle über Erik im 'Fliegenden Holländer' aus dem in Liszts Schriften aufgenommenen Aufsatze, dessen Verfasserin die Fürstin war*," and again, "*Wir führen aus ihrem Aufsatze über den Holländer einige Seiten an, welche genügen werden, um zu beweisen, wie fern ab ihr Geist von dem Geiste des Meisters sich bewegte*," i.e. "From her essay on the Holländer we quote a few pages that will suffice to prove how remote from the spirit of the master [Wagner] was the sphere in which her spirit moved," the said pages consisting of that laboured commentary on the Erik-Senta scene. With all deference to so esteemed and conversant a judge, however, the expression "*nos* fatrasies," already cited, shews that Liszt had *some* slight hand in this essay, or rather in parts thereof, beyond mere signature.

† L. had written June 8, 53, just before his Zurich visit: "Your poetical hints in the programme (especially on the Lohengrin prelude and Dutchman overture) have keenly interested me. I may also take occasion to impart to you a little article of my own on the Dutchman; if you approve, it shall be published." What became of that "little article," we do not hear: possibly it served as skeleton for this of a year later.

Europe. Beethoven's Fidelio is only now beginning * to acclimatise itself in London!" Carolyne, too, maintains the fiction of Liszt's sole authorship of all these articles; but she speaks of them so neutrally as to prove the largeness of her share in them (quite otherwise does the same letter extol his symphonic poems —"très-beau, très-noble, et très-élevé"). On the other hand, they are serious affairs to her, not to be chaffed as "fatrasies" and so on; whilst the whole tone of her letter, the most charming of the few preserved to us, breathes the same appreciation of the *poet* that pervades the greater portion of our essay.

Next we have Liszt writing Brendel Aug. 12 that, as soon as the last of the four above-named articles shall be 'set up' he will send him the *Holländer* essay, which "must appear in September—for various reasons that cannot well be gone into by letter," a formula with which we are familiar. To us the simplest reason would be, that this panegyric might spur the managers of German theatres to keener interest in a far-too-long-neglected work of Wagner's, and thus relieve the pinch in his finances; but *that* was hardly a topic too delicate for epistolary discussion, since Liszt already knew through Wagner that Brendel had been informed of the composer's straits (*vid. inf.*). Moreover, the same urgency is claimed for the two articles on works of the dead Boieldieu and Schubert. The cryptic "reasons" therefore, if not a mere phrase, must have been connected with Weimar rather than Zurich, and probably with our old friend the "long view." Waiving them, the letter ends with an imperious postscript, "Send me the proofs of the Dame blanche at once, and in September bring out the Flying Dutchman, which cannot wait longer."

Brendel might have replied that he could not very well print an essay he had not yet received, also that he had an editor's

---

* Wildly incorrect, as usual. *Grove's Dict.* informs us that *Fidelio* was produced "in London by Chelard's German company (Schröder, etc.) at the King's Theatre, May 18, 1832. In English (Malibran) at Covent Garden, June 12, 35. In Italian (Cruvelli and Sims Reeves, Recitatives by Balfe) at Her Majesty's, May 20, 1851." Chelard, by the way—who in 1843 had antedated Liszt's efforts for Berlioz in Germany, and in 1850 was ousted from his post of Weimar Kapellmeister—could have told the princess something about his London seasons of 1832-3, for he still lived at Weimar till his death in 1861.

right to choose his own time for publishing a contribution which threatened to monopolise several issues of his journal; but he meekly obeys, and the interminable commences to unwind its weekly length the 15th of September '54. It is just that length, that is the pity: were it not for an excess of needless and incongruous padding, this *Holländer* appreciation would in one respect be far the best in Carolyszt's Wagnerian group. And worst of all—it *begins* with little else than padding; to which we may attribute the ambiguity of Wagner's reference Sept. 29 (by when he can barely have received the second instalment): "I shall tell you nothing about myself"—he says—"nor anything about your essay—: regarding both, I shouldn't know where to commence or where finish. That I haven't had a sight of you this year, was bad!—Altogether I feel so boundlessly wretched, that I'm beginning to consider myself right-down wicked, since I [have to?] bear this misery.—Enough!"

If Wagner *had* begun to criticise this first instalment, he would have found enough to occupy him; an absolute zareba. Commencing with a page or two of painfully inaccurate history (*vid. sup.*), followed by a differentiation between the Lohengrin-Elsa and Holländer-Senta problems already erring on the side of over-elaboration, nearly two thirds of this chapter are devoted to a superficial comparison with the subject of a novel which it is improbable that a single reader of the *Neue Zeitschrift*, outside the Altenburg, had so much as heard of—*Une fille d'Eve*. More shame to them? Perhaps, as Balzac's brief but powerful story was originally published in 1839, and in '42 had been included in the first volume of the *Comédie humaine*.* Ignorance in this case, however, was wiser than knowledge, which would sadly have jagged the analogy. Sooth to say, the situations depicted by the German idealist and the French realist are about as like as chalk to cheese; to talk of "the idea of salvation won for another by self-sacrifice" as being even remotely at bottom of Balzac's tale, is simply inept.

This is how Liszt's princess starts her weird comparison of Senta with the Comtesse Marie de Vandenesse: "Both are allied with an amiable man, whose qualities would seem to

* Facts I borrow from a most readable translation by R. S. Scott, edited by George Saintsbury (pub. J. M. Dent & Co., 1897).

make for nothing but their happiness; both are in peaceful, well-to-do circumstances. To both the exemplary domestic virtue of a legitimate union becomes a burden; both yield themselves to a dreamy sympathy at first, but afterwards a violent love, for a being feared by everybody, avoided as a noxious thing,—a being outside their own sphere, with nothing but anxiety, grief and abnegation to offer them, yet whose daring spirit holds them with so infrangible a spell that they would gladly suffer pain and misery, even death for it," etc., etc., etc., continued for six long pages, part parallel, part contrast.

Overlooking details, would not the reader expect to find in Balzac's *hero* at least an object not quite unworthy such devotion as Carolyne depicts? Considering that the opening words of her next chapter assert that, "like Gretchen, Ophelia and Desdemona, Senta is not the chief figure in this tragedy . . . it is the Holländer who rivets all our interest," one would take for granted that the French Marie is attracted by a genuinely tragic character, the victim of some awful fate, though the princess is significantly silent on that point. Now turn to Balzac, and you will find the whole bottom knocked out of the wearisome analogy at once:—His Raoul Nathan, nicknamed *Charnathan* (charlatan) by another of his characters, leads a double life, with a very demi-mondaine mistress kept studiously from Marie's knowledge till her husband mercifully opens her eyes; after which Balzac informs us that "Mme de Vandenesse felt a pang of *shame* as she remembered her fancy for Raoul," whereas he polishes off his purposely satirised adventurer thus: "At the present day this ambitious author, of ready pen but halting character, has at last capitulated and installed himself in a sinecure like any ordinary being. Having supported every scheme of disintegration, he now lives in peace beneath the shadow of a ministerial broad-sheet. The Cross of the Legion of Honour, fruitful text of his mockery, adorns his buttonhole." *

Some sense of humour, so woefully deficient at the Altenburg, would have saved the princess from bracketing Wagner's "sad and noble hero" with an intentional lampoon on the unscrupulous place-hunter. Balzac had cautioned his readers against this self-

* From the translation referred to in my last note.

same trap; for he started his characterisation of his pinchbeck hero with, "In a word, this awe-inspiring Raoul is a caricature"; and a little later, "He was bound to be, and was for this Eve, listless in her paradise of the Rue du Rocher, the insidious serpent, bright to the eye and flattering to the ear, with magnetic gaze and graceful motion, who ruined the first woman. Marie, on seeing Raoul, at once felt that inward shock, the violence of which is almost terrifying. This would-be great man, by a mere glance, sent a thrill right through to her heart, causing a delicious flutter there"—*very* like Wagner's situation! Presently Balzac follows that up with, "Nathan pounced upon the Comtesse de Vandenesse like a hawk upon its prey," and "Ah! if women knew how cynical those men can be behind their backs . . . if they knew how they mock their idols!" But now comes the trap that manifestly snared the good princess: "In her rôle, as Marie conceived it, the less Raoul merited esteem, the nobler was her mission. The inflated language of the poet stirred her imagination rather than her blood. It was charity which wakened at the call of passion . . . She felt it a fine thing to be the human providence of Raoul." It was set in sight of the bird as plain as plain could be, with that "charity wakened *at the call of passion*," and the brick was propped with Raoul's transparent mock-heroics on the eve of a sham suicide: "I am leaving you pure and free from remorse. I might drag you into the abyss, but you stand upon the brink in all your stainless glory." Carolyne saw nothing save the "human providence,"—down came the brick.

Luckily no one noticed that the brick had fallen; for the princess herself remarks toward the close of this entirely irrelevant episode, "Wagner's operas have not been officially imported into the heavenly kingdom of *high fashion* as yet . . . at present they are read and studied principally by artists and thinkers, who, from indifference or intellectual pride, remain unacquainted with the regions whence Comtesses de Vandenesse proceed; and should an idle hour tempt them to dip into Balzac's book, they would scarcely be struck by the photographic fidelity of the picture." Not every "artist and thinker" can claim visiting acquaintance with countesses, no doubt; but surely most of them have seen the same kind of tragi-comedy enacted in somewhat humbler life, and hardly needed this capricious transposition of Wagner's subject into so utterly remote a key.

The real point of Balzac's story being studiously kept out of sight, no distinctly false suggestion as to Wagner's was thus imposed on readers *not* acquainted with the former's work. True, it is always nettling to be dragged through page after page of a similitude conveying no definite impression beyond that of the critic's eagerness to shew off 'culture'; for that, however, the signer of the article alone would have to suffer. Far more serious is a by-the-way, inspired by mere love of chattering, that chips at the very roots of our sympathy with Wagner's heroine: "Not without a dismal feeling of the infirmities of our best qualities, one has to confess that if Senta had not been born and bred on the shores of a fjord . . [ice etc. ad libitum] . . but to give her hand to a young man of high rank, his life divided between idleness and successes of the salon, she also would assuredly have lacked that energy of will which works great deeds, and justified afresh those words of Hamlet: '*Frailty thy name is woman*,' or the title of the book aforesaid." What imp of mischief can have prompted such a purposeless remark? Had it appeared in the *Grenzboten*, how the whole staff of the *Neue Zeitschrift* would have raised their hands in holy horror! Surely Cornelius or Brendel should have had the pluck to rule that out, especially as it was sailing perilously near the wind of a piece of autobiography possible to interpret unkindly; for which reason in itself the princess can never have seriously meant it. But there it stands, a warning against the danger of inexpertly mixing up the salon with the fjord, and we can understand the guardedness of Wagner's comments on this first instalment.

The second chapter (Sept. 22) is much better. In fact the rhapsody descriptive of the overture, however distorting, shews remarkable command of language; and this we may confidently claim as a Carolynian superstructure built on a flimsy technical foundation of Liszt's (of which more anon): it was precisely the tumultuous kind of theme best suited to her pen. But immediately thereafter we see the evils of a double authorship, since this second chapter takes us no farther than that instrumental threshold — its remaining two-thirds being devoted to mere generalisations, more or less germane to the work under review, but generalisations all the same. Evidently *Liszt's* prefatory remarks had been ousted from their destined place in chapter 2,

to make room for the Balzac digression, and are wedged in here by main force, though we had hoped to be getting to business at last. After that purple patch, a sober declaration that it is the duty of "the small number of true judges, of those capable of estimating the value of a work of art without considering the more or less of its favourable reception, to combine their forces to . . . pay such works their due and draw them to full light of day," falls rather flat. So Carolyne must have felt; for she suddenly cuts her colleague short, and dashes off at a tangent into "floods sweeping away temples and the peaceful homes of men" with no apparent cause. Yet divinatory instinct guides her to one truth at least, when she observes that "in the planning of his *Flying Dutchman* the poet Wagner has been bolder and gone farther than in his other products [i.e. the operas previous to the Ring-poem]. He has inwardly identified himself with this man to whom existence has become a chastisement, who, condemned to live, still yearns for death, invokes it as a lover, as a god," and so on—words to be remembered when we arrive at Wagner's letter of thanks.

Much else of Carolyne's, in this chapter, is extremely well thought out and put. For instance: "It is not for sake of picturesque effects, that Wagner strives to lend his heroes a supernatural character by external means . . . his creations are colossal from their birth. In themselves his characters are raised so high above all mediocrity of thought and feeling, that this very loftiness imposes the necessity of surrounding them with wonders." Clearly, *Opera and Drama* had been studied to some purpose, after all. Wherefore we must not grumble if we are whisked off next minute to a two-page description—really fine, were it but more apposite—of Phidias's Zeus and the Venus of Milo;* rather that this should conduct, in turn, to further plati-

* As previously recorded (vol. iii), P^ss Wittgenstein was a good judge of the plastic and pictorial arts, and in a less degree of poetry. Nevertheless it is amusing to run through the miscellany of her incidental allusions in these hundred pages:—Prometheus and the Oceanides, Medea, Adamastor, Penelope and Ulysses (*not* in Wagner's connection, *P.* I. 308, 310), Sibylline vision and Swedenborg, Pluto, Witches' Sabbath, Neptune and Gaia, Pandora (according to C. she lets Hope also escape from the box!), "Æolian harp trembling under the breath of passion" (cf. *Op. and Dr.*—*P.* II. 331), Cicero and Dante's Virgil, Byron's Lara and Manfred, Dante *and* Byron again, Indian

tudes on the changing forms of art, violently broken off by a peroration on the family likeness between the subjects of *Tannhäuser*, *Lohengrin* and *Holländer*, — a peroration stamped as Carolynian by the preference it gives to *Tannhäuser* (*cf.* 244 *ant.*).

With chapter 3 (Sept. 29) we at last embark on the analysis for which we have been kept waiting so long. And very well does it recommence from the point where we were stranded, the word-painting of the gradual calm being if anything more imaginative than that of the storm itself in chapter 2. Yet we are backed to that storm once again, to ship a couple of quotations from Oulibicheff *re* the two sea-storms in Mozart's *Idomeneo*, to which Liszt adds, "We leave any honest musician to compare these two scores, and he will admit that, with the material progress in art, the genius of to-day can attain effects whereof the old masters could only have had a presentiment"—a good point to make, though it rightly belonged to the earlier chapter. After a paragraph in defence of 'tone-painting,' a brace of dashes (introduced by L. R.) betrays the want of any definite chart, and off we sail again on a story that had temporarily cast anchor with the steersman's song.

Beyond a jarring detail or two, and a short tack toward Byron's *Manfred*, the remainder of cap. 3 steers a straight course down the channel of act i, mainly piloted by a paraphrase of Wagner's own *Remarks* (*P.* III), and none the worse piloted for that. Appreciation here is unstinted; e.g. "The Dutchman's monologue must be numbered with the most important the literature of music has to shew . . . The whole gamut of suffering is climbed, from stoical calm . . . to yearning for annihilation." To

---

poetry (cf. Wagner's letter Sept. 29, '54, "Why do you keep that Indian fairy-tale all to yourselves? I've prose enough around me"), Bürger's ballads, Gulnar, René, Mount Tabor, Fata Morgana, Van Dyck, Preller, Teniers and Jordaens, Rembrandt and Höllen-Breughel, Leonardo da Vinci, Raphael, Ribera, Pompeian backgrounds and medieval gold ditto, angels and vipers, martyrs and incense, tigers, dragons, alligators, lizards, porcupine, swan, siren and sea-mews, horses, nightingales and "a phosphorescent stream that heals all the wounds of existence," needles and pins, gnomes *and* monstrous-shaped claqueurs with hands of brass—supplemented by L. Ramann with an uninvited "Charybdis." It reminds one of one's fifth-form attempts to cudgel out prize-verse by dint of Lemprière or Smith: 'George Eliot,' however, exhibits other symptoms of the same complaint.

my mind this third chapter, taken as a whole, is the most unaffectedly sympathetic of all the five instalments, and proves the subject to have deeply moved at least one of the writers, though it does end with a meaningless gush regarding "the huge white sails of Daland's ship blown out like the wings of a swan."

Before passing to the fourth and fifth instalments, we must return for a moment to Zurich, where chapters 2 and 3 must have arrived by the time Wagner makes his second, and longest, reference to the essay (letter 165 *W.-L.*): "For me the last song of 'the world' has died out.—And do you know what—to my renewal of pride—has confirmed me once more in that sentiment?? *Your essay on the Flying Dutchman.* In these articles I have found myself again with clearest distinctness, at last, and thence learnt that we [two] have naught in common with this world [now refer back to *Carolyne's* "identified himself with this man who invokes death as a lover," etc.]. *Who, then, has understood me??*—**You**—and no other! [Alas! but it was.] And who now understands *yourself?* **I**—and no other! Be assured of it. You have opened to me, for the first and solitary time, the delight of being understood from top to toe: behold, into you have I ascended whole; not one fibril remains, not ever so faint a heart-thrill but you have felt it. And now I see that *this* alone is also being truly understood, whereas all else is pure misunderstanding or grievous error. What more do I want, having experienced this? What do *you* still want of me, having experienced this together with me! Let mingle in this joy the tear of a woman's dear heart—and what is lacking?"

I fancy you will agree that it was necessary to probe the Carolysztian *Dutchman* essay somewhat deeply, to understand this often-cited letter; also that we are now in a position to estimate much else in the Wagner-Liszt Correspondence—e.g. Wagner's complaint of next July that Liszt took no notice of his six-page Schopenhauer-Dante letter: "communications of this kind you have always answered by silence." So far as it had gone, that essay appeared to Wagner a revelation of what he had previously missed in his friend, namely divination of his *poetic* aim, a glimpse into the souls of his dramatis personæ and therewith into his own: "*Now* I understand you, since you understand myself," he cries (in effect, employing "thou" and "thee" as

usual, not the *plural* "you"). Will Liszt be brave enough to undeceive him, with an answer that it was the "woman's dear heart" that had fathomed him? Here was the supreme moment for confession: the sequel will shew if it was seized.

It may be objected that we have no external *proof* that Liszt did not write these better portions of an essay to which his signature was comprehensively appended. But if we are to assign to Pss Wittgenstein the generally-acknowledged blot on chapter 4—the vivisection of the Erik-Senta scene—at least we must be just and give her credit for *all* the psychological reflections, whether better or worse, since they all bear the stamp of one brain. Not that the said blot is anything so terrible in itself: on the contrary, it would be the cleverest piece of psychical analysis in all the work, were it but true to the poet's plain conception of his characters. Here it is matter in a distinctly wrong place, foreign matter, introducing a disharmony: transferred to a modern-society play, a twentieth-century novel, it would be applauded by every reviewer; with the Norway of Ibsen it would chime very well—only, not with that of Wagner. Moreover, it has a strong flavour of suggestion by recent study of that *Une fille d'Eve* which had played such havoc with the introduction; the subtlety of Balzac had found too ready a disciple. A few extracts must suffice:—

Senta is wounded in her secret sympathies—the most vulnerable spot in a woman's heart . . . Not without pride does she ask him, "Is this poor sufferer's fearful doom to leave me all unmoved?" Here also, Erik does not renounce the fatuous stubbornness usual to the male in such skirmishes, where women ever have wings to escape the surest-hitting bullets, or understand to roll themselves into a prickly ball, like hedgehogs, before the attack; where they are never at a loss for darts that rankle, for pins [hair- or hat-pins?] that wound in a perfidious kiss, for a platoon-fire of mocking laughter that bewilders and stuns us ere we know whence it comes. Never do they lack in solemn protestations that sound like alarm-bells,* never in that lizard-like agility wherewith they slip away just as one thinks he has hold of

* One would hardly credit it, but L. Ramann adds to this already silly metaphor the words "even without one's pulling at their rope"—*auch ohne dass man an ihrem Strange zieht.* Evidently this was the sort of jumble she admired, for she had embellished a previous clause in the same long sentence with the interjection "Eh, eh—who has not experienced it?!—" as if posing for Liszt himself.

them, in that strategic skill with which they invest the foe from every side, or snake-like lie in ambush for their victim, to hold it in a thousand coils at one spring . . .

. . . Poor Erik, one is sorry for him! But how many Eriks are there not in the world to be sorry for! "Does not *my* suffering, Senta, move thee more?"—he cries in wondrous naivety . . . Erik is imprudent enough to touch the untrue balance of a woman's judgment, comparison, that measures not by two scales and weights, but rather by a hundred. The same instant his inexperience is punished by one of those tongue-stings which the angels,* like the vipers, keep ever ready for assault. "O prate not of *thy* sufferings, 'gainst his!"—Senta replies, with that true deep tragedy of passion which unsettles the presence-of-mind even of a man of the world, and deprives him of the needful cold-bloodedness for repartee . . [Close on three pages of commentary, in all, to as many lines of text.]

. . . And were he imprudent enough to crown his blunders with the mildest insinuation that he could scarcely regret not being the victim of a curse to everlasting cruises, none the less would his lady be lost him for all time; that brutality would only give him the last *coup de grace;* in her eyes he would simply be a monster of unfeelingness, a cold materialist, an abhorrent epicurean!

For all its travesty of the dramatist's intentions, all its bizarre sophistication, there's something touching in this five-page blot when one considers the princess's motive. Out of pure unselfishness she strives with might and main to wrest for Liszt a reputation in belles lettres: to make him look quite fascinating, she even dresses him in her best new bonnet. Possibly he did protest that it wouldn't suit his style of profile—witness "our disputes on literary exigencies" (iii, 191); but in the end she overcame his each objection with a 'Wear it for my sake!' If you accept the whole apparel lent you, 'twere graceless to reject a part.

Had these articles stayed buried among the old files of the *Neue Zeitschrift*, they need not so much have concerned us: collected as part of the life-work of Wagner's most famous apostle, they have gained a spurious authority, and we may be sure that many an ambitious performer has gone to them for hints about his or her rôle. Imagine, then, the lasting harm such a confection must have done the simple characters of this Norwegian boy and girl. But worse remains, in the specific stage-directions mothered

* Cf. Balzac's "We may be sure that the angels in heaven have not lost all thought of self as they range themselves round the throne" (*A Daughter of Eve*, p. 99).

on the play: "Tired of his pesterings, and eager to listen to the narration of his dream,* Senta seats herself on the high-backed chair, and closes her eyes to shut out Erik's presence . . . Her head thrown negligently back . . . as one who is sick of an irksome encounter—she lends his words next to no attention at first. Little by little she seems to doze off, yet to hear more plainly what is said. During her clairvoyant sleep her gestures accompany his story," etc. Now, that is simply perpetuating as a model for posterity the tricks of a provincial singer who had 'created' the part for herself (ten years after its original 'creation' by Schröder-Devrient) without the author's supervision; and that Frau v. Milde was fond of over-gesticulation, is attested by several other asides in this essay. Only a few lines previously, we had been told by Carolyszt that at the words "wie schneidend Weh durch's Herz mir zieht" ("his anguish cuts me to the heart") Senta "covers her palpitating heart with trembling hands"; a few lines later, "left alone on the scene, Senta turns with grace towards the portrait, as though it could understand the affectionate coquetry of her gestures.† Stretching out her arms, she approaches it with looks of ineffable love" (just before the Dutchman's entry). That is in flagrant contravention of *Wagner's* stage-directions, which tell us that "after her outburst of enthusiasm [or "inspiration"—*Begeisterung*] she remains in the same position, plunged in thought, her eyes fixed on the picture": to import the idea of sentimental love, is to destroy the pathos of the whole drama.

Nor is this the first time the princess has come to grief over that picture. Passing by her original idea, advanced quite early

---

* Revealing her source, were it not plain as a pikestaff already, L. Ramann had just reproduced a misprint of the *N. Zft's*, "es mahnt mich ein unsel'ger Traum." One can scarcely understand Brendel's having overlooked an error that weakened "my dream"—i.e. a dream that had haunted the young lover till it ruled his every thought—into "*a* dream," or one among many. But, to repeat the old slip in a standard edition!

† "Die allein gebliebene Senta wendet sich voll Anmuth zu dem Porträt, als konnte dieses die liebevolle Koketterie ihrer Geberden verstehen"; *N. Zft* Oct. 6, '54, p. 161. For once in a way Miss Ramann has exercised a wise discretion and converted the "Koketterie," the source whereof is manifest, into a mere "Spiel" or "by-play." To have consulted the dramatist's own printed instructions, would have been still better; but those count for little, alas! in this conglomerate.

in the chapter, that it is "one of those coloured prints to be found in almost every mariner's abode"—which scarcely rhymes with a subsequent "the very image of this picture . . . this Vandyck come to life"—at the end of her ballad we found Senta "rushing with outstretched arms towards the picture, as if towards a living being"; which would precipitate her on the entering Erik in the same way as this last impertinence of Frau v. Milde's would bring her into the Dutchman's arms, unless the picture is to be assumed as hung on a side-wall, necessitating another clumsy expedient: "at the noise of the opening door, Senta turns and sees him" etc. Further, Carolyszt's Senta here "embraces (*umarmt*) her father without turning her gaze from the stranger"; an operation, not contemplated by the dramatist, which it would take an acrobat to carry neatly out.

One Weimar tradition, palpably derived from this essay, I distinctly remember to have seen maintained in London, not so many years back, by an otherwise first-rate German representative of "the Dutchman." Clearly he had laid to heart the following passage: "The Hollander passes his hand across his brow, as if trying to convince himself that this beauteous pure woman is no phantom of his brain, no Fata Morgana of his fevered hopes . . . This motion causes his black plumed hat to fall off, the agraffe whereof reminds one of that mysterious carbuncle with which the legend decorates the Prince of Darkness whenever, visiting the earth, he takes the shape of a cavalier. This is his first sign of life." Never mind the rhodomontade thus propped on a mere stage-bauble; never mind the inappropriateness of a cavalier hat to a sea-captain's wardrobe: the terrible thing is the breach of indoor 'manners,' not even *voluntarily* corrected. When first I saw that hat-trick, I naturally concluded it was a regrettable accident (unless he kicks it away, one is in constant fear of his treading on it): here we have its origin—the 'gag,' so to speak, of a Weimar barytone, embalmed by the poet-composer's bosom-friend. Right at the end of the story we have a similar liberty taken, when Erik "rushes off" to fetch assistance, and the Dutchman, after disentangling himself from Senta, "lays her in the arms of her father,* and springs on

* Like a returned parcel, a witty friend suggests; but L. R. had prudently half-toned this down. In the *N. Z.* it was more like a shot from a catapult:

board." But the most diverting of all these solecisms appears in guise of an objection: "We regret that the second act of the drama does not close with the love[!]-scene. At the last note of the duet the curtain should fall. The hearer has been held too long to rare and sublime tonalities of feeling, not to experience a certain banal C-major jar with the entry of Daland, Mary and Senta's companions. That Senta lays her hand in that of the Hollander in sight of all, can form no climax to what has gone before." Much may be said for the first two sentences —also much against, seeing that the drama has still to be continued, and Wagner never likes to leave us with a premature feeling that we have reached the end; but it is rich to find 'Liszt' in the last two taxing Wagner with an arrangement which he himself should have forbidden to the Weimar stage-manager.* The *author* did not contemplate this general incursion; in fact his Daland enters with a distinct: "Excuse! My folk *outside* are tired of waiting." For my own part, I have often wished that serio-comic father at the deuce; but thus wilfully to reinforce him! Why did Liszt not go and study the *Dutchman* at Zurich, when he had the opportunity in '52? O Weimar traditions!

It is a thankless task, such picking of holes, even when they stare us in the face: let me pass to a more congenial one.

This same chapter 4 (*N. Z.* Oct. 6, '54) holds also the princess's finest work. For lack of a better designation, she (or her first translator?) continually talks of Senta and the Hollander as a pair of "lovers"; yet she has pierced far deeper than that banal notion in her comments on their duologue. Such a theme might well stir anyone to eloquence, but with Carolyne it is almost a personal matter: with Senta's feelings she has been inspired herself—still is; out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. "O, wenn Erlösung ihm zu hoffen bliebe, Allewiger,

---

"The Hollander now succeeds in tearing himself away from Senta; he throws her with vehemence (*er wirft sie mit Heftigkeit*) into the arms of her father, and springs on board," etc.

* It is not impossible that this *was* a hit at that manager, as Liszt writes Brendel a year later that he has "not heretofore been able to see eye to eye with Marr, who now has handed in his resignation"; but a topical allusion should not have been permitted to remain in a would-be classic without some explanatory note by the editor.

durch *mich* nur sei's," sings Senta, and Carolyne re-echoes, "Highest affirmation of a feeling removed in its sublimity by an unpassable gulf from those plains whereon the comedy and farce of love are played, but where we cannot trace one inkling of its tragedies, heroic epopees and divine transfiguration! Highest affirmation of a feeling so unconditional and without bounds that it feeds on all that thwarts it, transmuting pain to pleasure, sacrifice to joy, abstinence to fulness of possession, humiliation to triumph, death to life, time to immortality, darkness to light, damnation to eternal bliss." Nay, do not smile! —those words are sacred, coming from the depths of a woman's soul. And so are these, two pages later: "There is bliss e'en here below, rare, but wellnigh superhuman bliss.* No word expresses it. Angels of Heaven float sheltering o'er it, and they alone can feast upon its Tabor-radiance unblinded by the sight. Veiling clouds withhold it from the earthly eye. Only art can reveal it to her initiates" [cf. "O heilige Götter, hehre Geschlechter! weidet eu'r Aug' an dem weihvollen Paar!" *Gtdg* prologue].

Then take the summing up of the Hollander-Senta scene: "Here we see the pendant to the great duet in the third act of Lohengrin. Both scenes, with differences conditioned by their diverse emotional situations, have not yet seen their equal on the stage, alike as regards their portrayal of love and its highest endeavours, its purest enthusiasm, as in respect of their form and fashioning of phrases, which bear us as on an outspread magic-mantle to sphere after distant sphere, in whose august rhythms the quintessence of clarified passion seems to distil from the breast. Only the rôles are exchanged in these two scenes. Here the man's past sin of pride is expiated by the woman's redemptory sacrifice; a sacrifice achieved spontaneously, through her own energetic will. There the woman's weakness destroys all magic of man's virtue. Alike here and there the woman holds the man's fate in her hands; on her depends, with her it lies, to bless him for aye, or fill him with eternal sorrow. When one descends to the foundation of Wagner's fables, one might term them a dramatising of the cult of that 'Eternal

* What possessed L. R. to substitute "——" for *selten, aber fast* ("rare but wellnigh") I cannot imagine.

Womanly,' in all its forms, wherewith Goethe capped the gigantic edifice of his Faust."—The *Communication* has taught the princess much in the four years since last she wrote of Elsa; and that much she has clearly embodied in what follows (too long to quote), ending: "What poet may have fathomed this great secret with profounder instinct than Wagner? . . . When Wagner shews Woman as the necessary mediatrix between man's cabined, often darkened thought, his cramped and oft misguided action, and his imperative need of an infinite unconditioned feeling—a need that develops in him with his thought and waxes with his energy . . . when he glorifies Woman as Man's indispensable road to salvation, he does not thereby leave the man inert; since through love of very love alone is that salvation to be reached"*—where we recognise the visible impress of Brynhild's "Zu neuen Thaten, theurer Helde, wie liebt' ich dich—liess' ich dich nicht?" (*Gtdg* prologue).

That Pss Carolyne had lately been studying more of Wagner's than simply the poem of his *Dutchman*, is amply suggested above. Early in July, about the time this essay was completed, she wrote the poet: "Your letters afford us the same joy as an almsgiving of golden pieces to poor people unaccustomed to receipt of aught save blows and copper pence. Grant us often this alms, since it cannot impoverish yourself!" (no. 163), whilst the end of cap. 5 in particular will shew that a packet of his older letters had also

* "Und wenn er das Weib als den unentbehrlichen Weg des Mannes zu seinem Heil verherrlicht, so lässt er diesen dadurch nicht in träger Unthätigkeit, da ja nur durch Lieb' der Liebe das Heil zu erringen ist." The poetic vapour of these closing words has been chilled to a prosaic drizzle by L. Ramann's fussy interference: "so lässt er diesen selbst darum nicht in träger Unthätigkeit verharren, da das Heil ja nur durch Liebe um Liebe zu erringen ist." Why not have left Cornelius' many-meaninged "der" in peace, instead of replacing it with a home-baked "um" ("love for love"—exchange and mart) and trampling all his rhythm? L. R. confesses that she had not the French original to go by; with a little imagination she might have guessed it to have run somewhat thus: "car ce n'est que par l'amour d'amour que le salut peut s'atteindre." In the same way, deeming it necessary to elucidate the clause which here precedes my dots, she jellifies it by repeating the *wrong* word, "feeling."—I see that Cornelius' essays have been collected, and are about to be reprinted: would it not be possible to supplement the volume by excerpts from these composite articles in the *N. Z.*? Next to Pss Wittgenstein, they at least are as much his as Liszt's; and they would gain so much by restoration.

been laudably impounded for ideas. That will bring us to the domain where Liszt undoubtedly collaborated with the clever lady: let us first reach the end of her own extensive preserves.

In the first half of cap. 5 (issued Oct. 13, '54) we find the same mixed qualities: a purple patch or two, a streak—this time, thank goodness, but a streak—of drawing-room *raisonnement* on Erik, and some really good appreciation of the drama as a whole. After the third act has been described with more or less success, chiefly *more*, we have a general verdict:—

For all the simplicity of this poem's plan, it will easily be recognised that in execution it gains in interest from scene to scene, the development of emotions mounting step by step, crescendo, to the high tragedy of the final situation. . . .

. . . Seldom can there have been so fine a possibility of giving one chief character such an unfolding on the stage; the more fortunate the poet who embraced it. In the overture we behold the Hollander afar, a plaything of storms he disdains as play. At his first actual appearance we come to know the high proud soul that bears its punishment for arrogance, the sorrow of eternal solitude. In the second act we admire this spirit for its grace of feeling, unrifled by the harshness of its lot . . . though no one yet has shewn him pity, he has not unlearnt compassion . . . suffering as none other, for very love he is ready to give up hope, to choose before acceptance of a sacrifice his own fulfilment thereof. At the supreme moment, just when we think his cup of sorrows drained to its last drop, we see him go to meet a torment worse than any borne before. A woman was to bring redemption to him—so ran the promise. But he loves that woman, and rather than expose her to the peril of everlasting perdition, he renounces at once the happiness of possessing her and every hope of his redemption, accepting an eternity of grief instead. The rivalry in noblest self-sacrifice between two lovers is one of those spectacles so deeply touching to the noble heart, that it will often take more delight in works whose subject shews this beauty, than in others whose greater wealth of diverse merits [*höheren Reichthum an verschiedenen Vorzügen*—somewhat vague] specific criticism rates higher.

The whole design of the text, its every penstroke, every line, reveals the hand of a true creator, a poet by the grace of God . . . [A comparison with Bürger's ballads.] . . .

That is beautifully expressed, transparently sincere. And that, there can be no doubt of it, is purely Princess Wittgenstein's. No such insight into either psychology or poetry will you find in Liszt's private letters (contrast them with his friend's).

What does it draw from Wagner?

Two months hence, when minor defects may be taken as erased by an indulgent memory, he writes: "Dear Franz, I'm coming more and more to the view that you really are a great *philosopher*—whilst I often think myself a thorough scatterbrain . . . Strange, how often I have found your thoughts again [in Schopenhauer]: though you express them differently, since you are religious,* yet I know you mean just the same thing. How profound you are! In your essay on the Holländer you often struck me with the force of lightning.† When reading Schopenhauer, I have mostly been with you: only you didn't observe it." —So, Wagner had *not* been undeceived.

Yet, some share Liszt must have had in this essay; on its musical side. That, however, is disappointing. I don't mean that it is not vociferous in its praise; e.g. "In the overture, the Hollander's monologue, the great duet, and the scene just

---

* In cap. 4 of the essay: "Her gaze still plunged in his, Senta recalls the many tears she has shed o'er his torments, her fervent supplications [?] to God that she might be elect to save him. Thus in their ecstasy have martyrs inwardly renewed their acts of faith when the hour of suffering drew nigh, the ardently-desired last moment, as if assembling all their strength and all their inspiration for one supreme upsoaring"; and again, "With the humility of a handmaid of the Lord, executing higher commands than the incentive of love-longing, she proves that pious modesty of sacred resolves which finds its only consolation in renouncing." The passage about Mount Tabor and the angels, occurring a few lines lower, I have already had occasion to quote; the remaining distinctively Biblical allusion appears in the general review, cap. 5: "On the greatness of the punishment is stamped the greatness of the offender, on the mercifulness of the hope that of the Punisher; in the condition of salvation we recognise the sacrifice's loftiness of soul. *Abyssus abyssum clamavit.*"

† Trafst du mich oft mit Blitzeskraft"—which I take to signify "caught my meaning." Certainly at the end of Carolyszt's chapter 2 there is a passage built on an Explanatory Programme of Wagner's own (see my vol. iii, p. 299): "*Tannhäuser* unrolls a moving picture of the strife between good and evil, freedom and authority, soul and senses; between the two principles which root so deep in Man and Nature that their eternal co-existence, no matter how it be argued away by the reason, still seems to the spirit the only possibility," and so on. Strange as this "*eternal* co-existence (*ewiges Nebeneinanderstehen*) of good and evil" may sound from the mouth of a devout Roman Catholic, it is a feature of the Princess's mental attitude: for *her* the philosophy of the East had indubitable attractions (cf. iii, 181).

described [the double chorus of the ships' crews, act iii], Wagner appears in his highest significance. They bear the stamp of his genius, the imprint of the master, and many a stage-work renowned for similar pictures must pale beside them and grow dark." But those words are prefaced thus: "If this piece [the said double chorus] were ever to be performed by one of those immense choirs that assemble on exceptional occasions . . . in a locale of good resonance it would produce an extraordinary, never-yet-attained effect." Surely such additional shouting was the last thing the composer would have desired;* this is not a whole nation fording the Red Sea, but simply the crews of two brigs. May we assign the comment to Liszt's partner, who had just painted a striking word-picture of the scene itself?

Throughout the essay there are a number of sporadic allusions to the music, most of them couched in terms so vague that the merest dilettante could have furnished them. For instance: "On listening to these symphonic outbursts of the wind-instruments, this whirlpool of sounds, which a mysterious rhythm seems nevertheless to cadence, to keep within a kind of indefinable harmony," and so on, apropos of bars 97 to 168 of the overture, about which I shall soon have more to say. Yet here and there the nature of the harmony *is* "defined," the veil withdrawn from the rhythm's "mystery"; and that, too, in midst of a like torrent of adjectives. How account for it? In one of two ways: either Carolyne, whom we may assume to have been able to follow a pfte-score, had been dictated a few rough notes concerning salient passages in the music, to incorporate with her word-painting; or, at a loss for 'local colour,' she would appeal to the occupant of the other desk in the blue chamber (busy at his *Hungaria*) with a "Do tell me the right term for such and such an effect," or "I want to know what instruments are brought in here." In that way the majority of these incidental remarks might be disposed of, and one could explain the oddness

* See 290*n inf.* The essay had just dwelt with gusto on the "six piccolos whose piercing tones in the highest register strike the ear as a shower of arrows" (accompanying the "Huih-ssa" &c., they represent a whistling wind). Wagner's score bears a direction, "Should there be bandsmen enough to multiply the 3 piccoli, they are to be placed on the stage, near the Hollander's ship; but if they can merely be singly cast, they are to be set in the orchestra." At Bayreuth (1901-2), with its immense stage, there were 9 piccolos behind the wings, and but one in the orchestra.

of the following judgment: "The pouting impatience wherewith the girls greet Mary's orders [to tidy up ere going out] gives rise to an animated little chorus, which, though not kept to so choice (*fein*) a tone as the Spinning-chorus, may be sure of universal success on account of an irresistible dash of liveliest gaiety." Delightful as is the Spinning-chorus, if comparisons are to be made I should have imagined the musician Liszt would have detected in this *Presto possibile* a perfect gem of "choiceness," * of finer water than the larger piece; it is as though we had Weber reflected from a scherzo of Beethoven's very latest manner, perhaps from a hearing of his quartets in Paris, and there is nothing to match it till we reach *Die Meistersinger*. Probably the Weimar stage-choristers could not take it at the requisite speed, and that would throw the Princess off the scent; but Liszt, with the full score before him?

Similarly one asks oneself if Liszt could really have written the opening paragraph of the 4th instalment: "An instrumental intermezzo precedes the second act. To such-like pieces Wagner devotes great care. His entractes are full of ingenuity (*genialer Züge*), full of subtle (*feiner*) poetic intentions. For the most part they are epic continuations or complements of the dramatic action, in which the contrasting or allied chief-motives and ideas of the opera relate to us, as it were, what occurs down to the beginning of the next act. They are treated with just as much mastery as the pauses conditioned by the course of events, or needful for the resting of voices, when the orchestra takes an independent part in the action. Such intervals had hitherto been filled with banal ritornels, that told us nothing; Wagner treats them with particular attention. He makes them take an important position in the drama, as an integral part thereof. With him, such moments complete the physiognomy of his characters, surround them with an atmosphere drawn from their specific passions." Admirably descriptive of the introductions to the 3rd act of *Tannhäuser* † and the 2nd and 3rd acts of

* Our own Sullivan would appear to have attached more value to it, since he paid it 'the sincerest form of flattery' in that chattering chorus which made the fortune of his *Pirates of Penzance;* just as his *H.M.S. Pinafore* contains many an (intentional?) allusion to this opera.

† Especially in its original lengthier form (*cf.* 108 *ant.*), still to be found in Messrs Boosey's pfte-score.

Lohengrin, one is convinced that the above will completely break down when applied to the case in point, even before one reads the very next three sentences: "This time the orchestra resumes the steersman's song and chorus of departure. We see the sturdy Daland sail away, surrounded by his crew, exulting in the chest of treasure the Hollander has sent on board, and happy to be bringing his daughter a bridegroom. We follow him till he reaches the haven; whereupon we are quickly transferred to Senta, we hear the humming of the spinning-wheels and a few notes of the refrain of the spinning-girls' song."

Extraordinary, if it was Liszt that missed the plain clue to this almost naïve little entracte. No "atmosphere of specific passions" has anything to do with it; "intermezzo" has. Precisely as the introduction to act iii, only more obviously, it simply *is* a "ritornel" and nothing else. Look back to the end of act i, and prior to the last 4 bars you will find 40 bars of finale note for note the same as the first 40 bars of this entracte, a chorus for Daland's crew there reinforcing the first 17, whilst those last 4 bars themselves are the merest hasty tag. Does that not tell us something? Beyond a doubt, if we have ever heard a performance on Bayreuth lines, it tells us what is now a proven fact*: namely, that *no pause* was originally meant to sever the separate acts of the *Flying Dutchman*. Those 44 bars less 4 at the end of act i were then undoubtedly continuous with the 32 that lead direct to the orchestral opening of the Spinning-chorus in act ii; perhaps even the closing chorus of act i itself was meant to be sung behind an already-dropped curtain (obviating the necessity for *two* movable ships); in any case the whole remainder was mere 'curtain-music,' a kind of musical dissolving-view. Regarded in this light, you see how cleverly that tiny theme which typifies the hauling of tackle on the two contrasting ships (*a* and *b*)

resolves itself into *c*, the rise and fall of the spinning-treadle. A moment's thought might have revealed this to Liszt as well, have

* See Appendix for Wagner's early letters on the point.

led him, not to rank this "intermezzo" with Wagner's later products of the kind, but to speculate why the composer had not troubled to re-start it with fresh matter once he had severed his acts; and that—who knows?—might have elicited from Wagner an actual remoulding of both these entractes. That was an opportunity for reconstructive criticism such as Wagner himself would undoubtedly have embraced (see his *Iphigenia* article); instead whereof—each point is missed. Surely this should be Carolyne's, again, not Liszt's.

There are two situations, however, in an essay of such length and pretensions, where the *musician* is bound to assert his rights; namely, its beginning {and / or} its end. Save for a few sentences, the beginning has been handed over to the lady-help; so we must turn to the end, the second half of cap. 5. Here we have Liszt speaking for himself, at last, though Carolyne is allowed to introduce a stray page or so of embroidered reminiscences from Wagner's letters of three to four years back. And here, after the really able summing-up of the poem, we should look for what we scarce have found as yet, an enlightening review of the music as compared not only with that of *Tannhäuser* and *Lohengrin*, but also with *Rienzi*. Certainly, quite early in the first chapter we had the following: "It cannot be denied that the Flying Dutchman is perceptibly inferior to Wagner's later works. Here his musical conception is not nearly so pithy and firm (*markig und fest*), as in them. One sees that he is trying to escape from the idols to which he, too, had sacrificed, but not yet waging war against them to the death. Only here and there does he venture forth with his own grand style, and but timidly does he withdraw from the dominion of traditional forms, to which he still yields room, not systematically rejecting them as afterwards." But that was a most general statement, needing endless qualifications: now is the time to substantiate it in a reasoned retrospect. From an article signed "FRANZ LISZT," with his world-wide musical experience, we hope for something vastly superior to what a Brendel could turn out by the yard, some flash that will throw the whole work into relief.

Of all the four Wagnerian operas before the German public, this was at once the most neglected and, evolutionally speaking, the most interesting. "So far as my knowledge extends, in the life of no artist can I discover so surprising a transformation,

accomplished in so brief a time, as shews in the author of those two operas" (*Rienzi* and *Holl.*), says Wagner himself in 1871 (*P.* VII., 3). In the fifties it would have been an inestimable service, to illustrate this advance on the musical side—Liszt had heard *Rienzi* under Wagner—and trace its progress up to *Lohengrin*. No need to disparage the *Dutchman* in so doing,* for it has peculiar beauties of its own, and a thematism quite remarkable for "pithiness and firmness"; but the Erik-Senta scenes, e.g., instead of being abandoned to that caricature of their psychology, might have been approached from the musical standpoint, shewing how in the first, rather than in the great Hollander-Senta duet, lay the archetype of the still greater duo in act iii of *Lohengrin*, and in the second that of Lohengrin's farewell. Still more pertinent would it have seemed, since Liszt had ear-marked this peroration for himself, to dwell on the close parallel between Lohengrin's 'narration' and that of the Hollander at the drama's end, where actual phrases from the one are echoed in the other: † yet the music here is dismissed with a couple of lines about a faint resemblance to the "Curse-motive" (more properly, Hollander-theme) and a "declamatory vehemence of tone which needs an unusual organ, to be entirely reproduced and grasped"—a highly questionable need, as the voice has to contend with the full 'wind' in no more than two passages of from 2 to 3 bars each. Neither have we any comparison of the 'three romantic operas' in point of rhythm, harmony and orchestration: nothing, in fact, to constitute this essay an historic monument, a classic in the literature of music.

That is why I have called Liszt's final effort in public Wagnerian criticism so disappointing. What he does give us, whether laudatory or otherwise, in no way compensates for what he might or should have given. A bird's-eye glance at that peroration, which covers twelve large octavo pages in the book edition, will make this clear:—

After a paragraph concerning the Paris transaction of 1841 and

---

* For that matter, Liszt does not hesitate to characterise the duet in act i as "somewhat operatic," or to speak of "intentional musical commonplaces" assigned to Daland. Of course one agrees with him that it is *the* weak spot in the opera.

† Now I come to think of it, the 1846 revision of the *Dutchman* score must have directly preceded the composition of *Lohengrin* act iii.

Dietsch's *Vaisseau fantôme* (see i, 325), palpably squeezed out from its intended place, Liszt proceeds: "But if the opera 'Der fliegende Holländer,' text and music by Wagner, is to attain the full effect intended by its grandiose construction as much as by its poetic contents, Fortune must bring to the casting of its two chief rôles two unusually gifted artist-natures such as are scarcely to be found even singly." At the peroration's close we shall discover this to be a veiled compliment to the Weimar exponents; here, put as a general proposition, it would be dubious diplomacy even if correct, as it must rather scare the hesitant Director.—Then a Carolynian page on Raphael &c. reduced to engravings, ending "What the sight of an original is to painting, to music is the perfect reproduction of a masterwork," conducts to a disputable observation that the works of Palestrina &c. have passed into oblivion *because* the traditions for their execution had died away; which, being developed, brings us to another deterrent: "Of all the works of Wagner, probably the Flying Dutchman the most urgently calls for gifted, pre-eminent singers and a perfect execution, to be quite understood and not miss its effect." In support is quoted, not Wagner's *Communication*, which says something slightly different, but his *private* opinion that "the singer of Lohengrin remains to be born"; which neither helps matters in itself, nor proves the allegedly extreme difficulty of a rôle (Holl.) about which Wagner has only just observed in print that, the monologue in act i once rightly rendered, the effect of the rest of the work is certain (*Remarks*).

At this point we pass to an observation that "Wagner rightly feels that in dramatic music he has arrived at the moment of development prepared by Gluck and Weber." Carolyne interrupts with a long poetic metaphor on Neptune and Gaia, but we do get back to the "school created by Gluck and strengthened by seventy years of opposition," with a prophecy that "at a certain point of time, not yet determinable, as chance and outer circumstances play so large a rôle in affairs of the kind, our century will accustom itself to this line of beauty, make itself familiar with and acknowledge the full value of the secret laws, the inner logic of this school [?!], which more than every other eschews the mediocre." Here, one would have thought, was the cue for some enlightenment about those "secret laws," that "inner logic." Not so—we are referred to the mere executants again: "Every

important period in Composing has at like time given rise to a school of Singing conformable to its needs and requirements . . . Sooner or later the decisive introduction of the declamatory style will necessarily be followed by development of such a new school; and, as we ascribe to Wagner's works the triumph of that style,* so we presuppose that the alterations which it must bring about in the artistic training of executants will take place in Germany first and foremost . . . Inasmuch as Wagner has created for his fatherland a drama harmonising with its national genius, he has at like time imposed on it the duty of calling forth a school of Singing conformable to his dramatic manner."

Then we veer once more to the "evolution of the declamatory style" itself from Gluck to Weber, in vaguely general terms, with Wagner as "the result" (see 243 *ant.*), culminating in: "Wagner is the founder of German Opera, or rather, of the *Musical Drama.* But this new art-species (*Kunstgattung*) can only attain its full glory through other interpreters than the present executant artists. In Germany, a school of Singing yet must form itself; for at present it scarcely owns singers." Rather bold of Liszt, thus openly to challenge the supremacy of his old friend Meyerbeer; to whom, however, the intervening page had prudently assigned France for domain. But shall we get any farther, with this reiterated demand for a school of German singing? In his old letters to Liszt (see iii, 55, 161) Wagner himself had more than once laid stress on the need of well-trained singers—with a qualification: will Liszt develop the theme to some purpose? Alas! his only contribution to our knowledge is a statement we can easily credit, as regards the not so distant past at least, that of the "utter lack of professors and conservatoires that have won themselves a name, as in other lands, through tuition in this branch of art. Never does a singer boast himself a pupil of this or that German master or school." How German singers ruin their voices, we hear indeed, but not one tiniest suggestion *how* to form that "school" to remedy it. "It is surprising that in Germany, this land of theories and systems, of the most reasoned-out artistic tendencies, the art of Singing should be so exclusively

* I should state that *all* my translations from this essay are strictly based on the original wording in the *N.Z.* 1854.—L. R. here takes the liberty of watering Liszt's "ascribe to" (*zuschreiben*) to "perceive in" (*erkennen in*); by no means a solitary manifestation of her neutralising tendency.

left to the caprice of practice, ay, empiricism"—a page later; but the proposed cure is either a sheer misapprehension, or a befogging, of Wagner's ideas (cf. iii, 159, 162): "The cause probably lies in the very fact that Opera has not been nationalised as yet, and consequently has not as yet brought forth a school of singing in keeping with its character." Not the barest skeleton of a *plan* for thus "nationalising" Opera, such as Wagner had elaborated in his Dresden days (*P.* VII.) and more recently with his *Theatre at Zurich;* not even an explanation of the phrase: no, the failings of a mixed repertory are sketched, on the lines of Wagner's own letter to Liszt of three years since, but without the accompanying hints for its reformation. All this part might just as well have been compiled by the princess—for what we know, it may—since it evinces nothing beyond an aptitude for glibly repeating one's lessons.

With the final three pages we at last reach something more specific: "Wagner's operas demand very beautiful, sonorous and mellow voices, noble diction, intelligent and impassioned declamation, delicately suggested and finely executed intentions [*zart angedeutete und fein ausgedrückte Intentionen*—meaning?] and animated by-play (*ein lebendiges Spiel*)—qualities that presuppose an extensive mental culture and a conscientious study, begun in early youth, of the works of a school to which one must devote oneself entirely and in earnest." Excellent as a council of perfection, does that make at all for immediate service? Hear what Wagner himself had told his friend two years ago: "Will you ask me if one can expect of an inferior singer what a Tichatschek failed to achieve [in *Tannh.*]? I reply that, in spite of his voice, T. did not bring out many a point that has been possible to much less favoured singers . . . he has only brilliance or softness in his voice, not one true *accent of grief.* The singer of the Hollander here [by no means trained to the 'school' from early youth] did far more for me than the Dresdner and Berliner, notwithstanding that those had better voices." Sympathy with the *character* impersonated; complete forgetfulness that one had a carbuncle in one's hat and looked like a Vandyck portrait: given those, with a little intelligent backing by the conductor and stage-manager, the most ordinary barytone could make something impressive out of the Hollander in a moderate-sized theatre.

Interesting, quâ history, is Liszt's asseveration that in the old

Italian vocal course the pupils had to practise "nine hours a day," correcting their faults (it is L. R. that adds "of enunciation") by dint of "places where there was a very distinct echo," and "only after six, eight, ten years of such a novitiate, did those artists venture to appear in public." Yet, if this be speaking to the point, it postpones to the Greek Calends all possibility of performing "Wagner's operas." Apparently, too, it *is* said seriously, as Liszt continues: "Not until schools for the declamatory style exist in Germany, such as have existed in Italy for other works and in France for other objects; not until a generation of artists shall have been trained as Wagner's characters require *— not till then will people learn their full, enthralling scope."

Notwithstanding its general homage to Wagner, how gladly would one exchange quite two-thirds of this meandering peroration for a well-inked reproduction of one morsel of his own advice: *Let your singers begin with book-rehearsals. Look to it, that they be good actors in the first place: who cannot speak well, how should he ever sing?* Some sort of High-school of dramatic singing was an indisputable need in Germany; but, whence was to come its chief-instructor? Liszt's counsel hovers in the clouds: the simpler remedy might be put in force at once. Example was wanted, far more than precept.

Such an example Liszt quotes indeed, in Schröder-Devrient; but stultifies it by following with that of Tichatschek—much as if you followed Calvé with Mario, supposing them contemporaries. As to Herr and Frau von Milde, here classed with the more celebrated two as "models of noble acting and pathetic declamation," one is a little doubtful after what one has just read (258-9 *ant.*); yet—is this whole peroration, perhaps, a roundabout road

---

* Here L. R. attempts to interpret that "nationalising of Opera," of a page or two back, by intruding a scarcely helpful clause: "not until then will vanish those deficiencies which stand in the way of the national execution of national stage-works." Or did Liszt himself, in this one instance, add a remark to the proofs of the 1881 edition?—By one of those fatalities which seem to dog the reviewers of "Liszt's gesammelte Schriften," this very interpolation was selected by Dr L. Schemann in the *Bayr. Blätter* 1887 (p. 303) as evidence that Liszt had "energetically proclaimed 32 years ago the necessity that was destined later to afford his friend so much food for thought and trouble." Even in 1854 alike thought and expression would have been considerably "later" than Wagner's own.

to their praise? Its conclusion would almost suggest that, since it directly succeeds the words last-quoted :—

"The principal rôles in the Flying Dutchman urgently* require such qualities, if they are to stand out (*hervortreten*) from the surging background of a highly nuanced (*sehr nuancirten*), at many moments an overpowering orchestra. The artists, who undertake this task, do not need so extensive a vocal compass as for parts like Bertram or Fides; but their voices must be of noble quality, great amplitude (*mächtige Fülle*) and richness; the timbre must be shimmering, soft as velvet, vibrant as the strings of an æolian harp that tremble to the breath of passion [Carolyne, of a verity]. The Hollander's monologue, Senta's ballad, and the grand duet in the second act, are this drama's most important moments, and offer difficulties in plenty. It would be to destroy their effect together with that of the whole drama, however, should they not be rendered with a power that forbids all thought of fatigue, retains its might (*mächtig bleibt*) from beginning to end, without one shadow of exhaustion." The essay's last words: a zareba at the end, by Liszt (?), after a zareba at the beginning by Carolyne. Through thoughtless magnifying of its "difficulties," the opera is fenced off from all but the abnormally daring. Would it not have been more to the purpose, to warn future conductors *not* to let their orchestra prove "overpowering"? Though once raised in Berlin, no complaints of the kind had been heard two years ago at Zurich: possibly you may remember why, but I shall remind you in an instant.

Oddly enough, too, Liszt had gone to the opposite extreme in what may be considered his professional interjections in course of the Princess's amateur account of that "grand duet" (cap. 4 of the essay). Thrice is the instrumentation referred to, there. First with regard to the opening section, from "Wie aus der Ferne," to "mir zum Theil," aptly described as a twofold monologue: "Surprising is the moderation of colouring observed in

---

* L. R. here interpolates the preposterous clause "more urgently than those of any other work"; also, with more astuteness, "qualities such as those of the artists named." She further intensifies Carolyszt's indiscreet (and incorrect) remark about an "*überwältigenden Orchester*" by replacing "*hervortreten*" with "*verschallen*"—mutatis mutandis—so that we have to read "unless they are to be drowned in the waves" of that orchestra's sound. This is to "edit" with a vengeance.

the orchestra here; it would seem as if it did not dare to add one complementary stroke to the splendid shapes of the two lovers. Only the horns give out a restless pulsing, to which we listen as to the beat of two tumultuous hearts. The phrases [apparently the vocal] are broad and long-drawn; there are few like examples of such a slow majestic streaming forth of melody." Secondly, at Senta's first direct answer ("Wer du auch sei'st . . . Gehorsam wird ich stets dem Vater sein!"): "With these words of Senta's, uttered as an irrevocable vow, the rhythms of the horn become more rapid, as if the beating of her heart had doubled." Thirdly, at her "Wohl kenn' ich Weibes heil'ge Pflichten" etc.: "The accompanying wood-instruments leave to the voice the expression of resolve, merely surrounding it with an atmosphere of infinite love . . . Only twice do the first violins intrude on her answer, and then with a figure borrowed from the Hollander's melopöe; a figure which, through its appearing [i.e. being founded] on the selfsame chord as in that, but eurhythmically transposed into major, seems to shimmer like a smile of happiness on lips we have seen so painfully twitching, a ray of joy in eyes that had lost their glow beneath the stars of every zone."

The second of these three references needs no comment, save that "the horn" should strictly be plural; the third may help us to affiliate the first. Carolynian of course is the whole embellishment, and very pretty too; yet even the technical part can scarcely have been so much as dictated by a musician: "*auf demselben Accord, nur durch eine eurhythmische Bewegung nach Dur versetzt.*" Of 'enharmonic changes' one has heard, but never of a "eu*rhythmi*c movement" from minor into major: neither term will meet the case—merely the untrained eye, neglecting a dropped accidental (A sharp), is surprised that a phrase which sounded so differently with a signature of 2 sharps should *look* exactly the same when its signature bids 5.* Had

* Were there no other internal evidence that the "collected" form of this essay was *not* passed for press by Liszt himself—whatever he may have done with volumes not concerning us—ample proof would be furnished by the two musical illustrations here added to the 1881 edition (p. 216). Each of them is a semitone lower than what appears in all the scores; i.e. they are printed in *flat* keys! It is easy to account for: as not unfrequently with the "note-examples" in her *Franz Liszt*, Frl. Ramann seems to have forgotten to write down the key-signature for either of these passages, and the printer (mistaking

Liszt really been responsible for this technical remark, we should have expected some allusion to the fact that the "figure" had been heard "on" more than one chord, in more than that "melopöe": it is a very old acquaintance, a marked feature of the accompaniments to Senta's Ballad and the Hollander's first monologue (act i), above all, of the overture itself—in none of which places does this essay take note of it; perhaps the most original of all the master's figurations, with exception of its counterpart, Loge's Fire-motive, it vividly characterises the Hollander's curst "life on the rolling wave."*

Now we may haply account for that "only the horns" in the first reference. Half a peep at the score must have sufficed an adventurous lady, or Liszt's dictation must have been suddenly interrupted, for the lithographed score will "surprise" you here by the way in which that colouring is touch by touch *enriched* till the entire orchestra is aglow as we reach the cadenza (itself unaccompanied). In a moment I shall prove that some disaster did really happen to the Weimar score; but, that this beautiful piece of instrumentation was absent from the model Wagner meant to be followed there, I cannot suppose.

One word more on that duet; no longer a technical word, but its summing up from the musical standpoint:—"At first it might seem as if this duet, extending to four hundred bars, contained prolixities (*Längen enthielte*). But whoso hears to understand and grasp, not merely to have heard sans comprehension, will find no link superfluous here; he will be unable to remain cold in presence of this display of feelings, which, suppressed and motionless at first, then shy and timorous, at last draw all within their magic ring with ever greater glow and animation. This

---

her accidental sharps for naturals) must have guessed the wrong pair of keys; five-flats and two-flats, instead of two-sharps and five-sharps.—Far worse confusion is created by example 7 (*ibid.* p. 168), which certainly is not the "rhythm" Liszt meant; also by an interpolated reference on p. 215 to another example ("Nr. 17"). No: I can never believe that Liszt looked through these proofs.

* A. Heintz in his *Holländer* theme-book (1895) calls it the theme of "Verdammniss" or "Damnation." I don't quite like the label, as it needs qualifying by that very character of billowy motion the figure so admirably expresses. Carolyszt, on the other hand, gives the name of "Verdammungs-motiv" to the opening theme of the overture etc.; still more inappropriately, since that is clearly the Hollander's personal mark or 'cry.'

scene conducts us so deep into the lover's tristful exaltation, the supernal happiness of the beloved, that even the smallest curtailment must do decisive injury to the unity of the whole." The pen is obviously the pen of Carolyne (you know her style by now); but is it not also her voice, the voice of the appreciator of poetry, pleading with future conductors to spare this scene from a mutilation once possibly threatened in her presence?

Two voices are distinctly to be heard in certain portions of the essay. Despite its last chapter's remark on the drama's "gaining in interest from scene to scene" and "revealing the hand of a poet by the grace of God" (263 *ant.*), the opening pages—where we can certainly trace the more sober style of Liszt—contain the following: "Even if Wagner himself had not informed us in the 'Fore-word to his Friends' [*Communication*] wherewith he prefaces his 'Three Opera-poems,' that the subject of this opera was not originally his own invention, we should infer it from the ballad-like build of the whole,* from the lack of scenically effective (*scenisch wirksamer*) situations, from the almost excessive moderation in the employment of dramatic motives." All depends on the *kind* of "scenic effect" one is looking for—e.g. Tannhäuser's breaking-up of the Wartburg assemblage, or Ortrud's arrest of the Bridal progress—and Liszt had not as yet been trained by Wagner's later dramas to look out for the right kind; but it is impossible for the present generation to agree with him that the drama of *Der fliegende Holländer* is one whit less distinctively Wagner's "own" than *Tannhäuser* or *Lohengrin;* eh! or the RING itself, with the dramatic construction whereof I still maintain that it bears a closer relation than do the intervening works.

As the last excerpt throws no little light on that "At first it might seem"—*Anfangs möchte es scheinen*—let us ask if at first it *had* seemed. A question of history that must be honestly faced: Why was the *Holländer* not produced at Weimar until four years after *Tannhäuser's* success there, and some two years after that of *Lohengrin*, although Liszt was begging for a new work of Wagner's most of the time?

At the end of May 1849, returning a borrowed passport (ii,

* A remark most plainly derived from that *Communication* itself: "When about to entitle the finished work, I felt strongly inclined to call it 'a dramatic ballad'" (*P.* I. 370).

373-5), Wagner wrote Professor Wolff of Jena: "In a few days Liszt will receive from my wife [then still in Dresden] a parcel of scores etc.: please ask him to open it. The Lohengrin score I want him to examine at some leisure . . . when he has done looking through it, I beg him to send it with the other scores and textbooks to me in Paris. The one copy of the score of the 'Flying Dutchman' is intended by me for the Weimar theatre: this, together with textbook, let Liszt therefore take out of the parcel and keep back." Clearly, when Wagner passed through Weimar, on his flight from Germany, there had been more than some talk of a speedy production of the *Holländer* in that city. But that was ere Liszt had either heard the work or seen the score; all he knew about it then, was that it had nowhere had a run of more than half a dozen performances (unless, perhaps, at Cassel).

A week after that, June 5, '49, Wagner writes him from Paris: "One piece of news will lift me completely up again, namely if people have remained true to me in little Weimar. One single piece of good news, and I swim on the top of the waves!" Even the metaphor makes clear the nature of the hoped-for tidings.

June 18, his next letter: "I spoke to you at Weimar of an allowance of 300 thalers I should like to ask of the Grand Duchess as against my operas, alterations in the same (*Abänderungen derselben*), and so on." Here again, of "alterations," or "amendments", there could be question only as regards *Rienzi* and the *Holländer;* and what those alterations would mean in the latter case, we may pretty well guess,—a certain amount of correction of the proffered score in line with the revised instrumentation of 1846. That point I must ask you to pigeon-hole awhile.

Over Liszt's reply (no. 21 *W.-L.*) a dotted veil has been cast. The printed form of this letter breaks off in the middle of a sentence: "L'admirable partition du Lohengrin m'a profondément intéressé; toutefois je craindrai pour la représentation la couleur *superidéale*, que vous avez constamment maintenu. Vous me trouvez bien épicier, n'est ce pas, cher ami? mais je n'y puis que faire, et la sincère amitié pour vous m'autorise peut-être à vous dire. . . ."* To peep behind veils is always a delicate

* "The admirable score of Lohengrin has profoundly interested me; nevertheless, for its representation I should fear the *superideal* colour you

business, but I fancy the present one has betrayed most of us into supposing that the withheld (or possibly, destroyed) continuation launched into further adverse comments on *Lohengrin*. On the contrary, a month later Liszt speaks of his growing "enthusiasm for this extraordinary work," but not till thirty months thereafter do we hear a word from him about the *Holländer*. To my mind, nothing could be more conclusive proof that the continuation of letter 21 raked the poor "Dutchman's" vessel fore and aft, putting it out of all immediate prospect of a Weimar engagement. We have no right to find fault with Liszt for lagging so long behind Spohr in this instance; he had made his first acquaintance with Wagner's works from quite another direction, *Rienzi* and a truncated *Tannhäuser*. But the fact of Weimar's having once declined to give the *Holländer* a hearing—whereof there can no longer be any doubt—is not without its bearing on the essay under discussion, and may also account for the slightly apologetic tone adopted with regard to this opera by its author in the *Communication*.

My conclusion is supported by the total absence of direct allusion either to *Lohengrin* or the *Holländer* in Wagner's answer of July 9, '49 (no. 22). Possibly such an allusion was contained in the original of this letter, and has merely been omitted from its printed form: possibly, on the other hand, the criticism on *both* works was passed-by in silent resignation.* Other points in no. 21 are plainly answered here, but the following is the sole reference to the matter now exercising our minds: "So soon as I have anything ready, I'll send it also to you. Meanwhile I have only the urgent request to make you, to send me hither [Zurich] my scores and the other literary things which have reached you

---

have constantly maintained. You will think me rather a commoner, dear friend? but I cannot help it, and sincere friendship authorises me perhaps to tell you. . . ." The date, probably contained in the unpublished termination of this letter, would be somewhere about the last week of June '49.

* Cf. the *Communication*, touching the Dresden public's disappointment with the *Holländer:* "My friends were crestfallen; almost all they could think of, was to wipe out the impression by a fervid resumption of *Rienzi*. I myself was disheartened enough to hold my peace, and leave the *Dutchman* undefended" (*P.* I. 320). The parallel seems so exact, that, remembering the date of writing (summer to autumn '51), one is tempted to deem it a parable.

from my wife: I must get back into some sort of swing with myself, for the bell to sound once more . . . Dear Liszt, don't cease to be a friend to me: make allowances for me, and take me—as I am!"

July 29, '49, Liszt writes: "All your scores (excepting the overture to Faust) I despatched last week to you at Zurich. It came hard to me, to part with Lohengrin." The Faust overture, lent him last January (ii, 296-7), had not formed part of the original parcel; but, as we shall see in a moment, there certainly was another "exception," that *Holländer* score "intended for the Weimar theatre." Liszt's silence hereon is just as eloquent as had been those dots in letter 21. Plainly, the *Holländer* is shelved at Weimar; not even its overture can have been given a trial, though that had been the earliest step towards the *Tannhäuser* production.

Then Bülow, almost fresh from Zurich, arrives on the scene; young Hans whom I have already assumed (iii, 338) as rescuer of the *Holländer's* companion on the shelf, that selfsame Faust overture. Suddenly comes word from Liszt Jan. 15, '52: "Next season we shall go straight to your Flying Dutchman, which I did not want to propose this winter for local reasons, explained to B. [between whom and Wagner there had most likely been some correspondence on the subject]. You may firmly rely on me, that your works shall be kept more and more on foot at Weimar." Wagner replies to that: "It pleased me much, that you're thinking of bringing the 'Flying Dutchman,' too, to performance; and I hope among those who love me you won't miss the reward for your labours. I'll arrange with you about the mounting later on . . . Don't let the band-parts be copied out before I've sent you a score in which I [shall?] have newly retouched the instrumentation after my latest experiences of orchestral effect" (Jan. 30, '52).

In all probability the '52 revision of the *Dutchman's* scoring was prompted in the first place by nothing but a desire to make it more palatable at Weimar, for it is not till just after Liszt's proposal that we hear (in a letter to Uhlig, Jan. 22, '52) the first vague talk of that Zurich production related in vol. iii; whilst the wish to take personal stock of its effect may have led, in turn, to Wagner's yielding to his Zurich friends' solicitations. Then, as he tells Uhlig in subsequent letters, "I set about revising the instrumentation, but rather lost patience at last, and mostly con-

tented myself with few alterations . . . only the close of the overture have I taken in hand more thoroughly. I remember, it was just this close that always much annoyed me at the performances" (Dresden 1843 and Berlin 1844). That alteration in the overture is the main point I am driving at.

Sending a copy of this newly-amended score to Uhlig toward the end of March '52, to be kept as model for correction of any that might be required in future by the theatres, Wagner is most particular in his instructions that "the amendments must be made very distinct; often it would be best to have them written out on new cartons: rather lay out an extra dollar or two, than leave anything unclear." Further, "As Liszt thinks of mounting the opera this summer, I beg you to redemand of him at once the Weimar score, sent there by my wife in the summer of 1849, so as to get it corrected before they copy out [the parts]. When corrected, you will return it to them." Here I want you to bear in mind that Wagner explicitly refers to the score remaining at Weimar since 1849 as that *theatre's* score—*die dortige Partitur*—not as a private gift to Liszt; exactly as he had spoken of it in that bygone letter to Prof. Wolff (278 *ant.*). The point will recur.

Meanwhile, as we also learnt last volume, upon borrowing the Dresden band-parts Wagner was surprised to find that in 1846, with the experience reaped from *Tannhäuser*, he had already made much greater changes in the *Dutchman* scoring: "in particular the brass was more carefully reduced. Only the overture—close—have I recently treated more thoroughly." Now, the very fact of this coming as a discovery, proves that the lithographed score he had with him at Zurich was in a virgin state till 1852, one of the ordinary uncorrected copies. On the other hand, his memory thus refreshed, he now remembers that in 1846 he had revised *two* copies of the score, identically of course, one for the Dresden, the other for the Leipzig theatre, at neither of which had they been used; wherefore he begs Uhlig to take steps to recover the Leipzig copy, as nobody besides himself *could* have a legal claim to that, and its recovery would obviate all friction with the Dresden bureaucrats. Exactly how soon Uhlig managed to effect that recovery, I cannot specify, but mid-July we read in a letter of Wagner's to him, "I know nothing of a second score

[sent] to Schmidt:* probably it is one previously procured through the book-trade." To my mind, this points to the conclusion that the 'Leipzig' revision was merely lent to that theatre in '46 for the purpose of rectifying thereby another virgin copy of the lithographed score—a detail of the transaction easily forgettable in course of six years. And that may explain not only Wagner's being left himself without a private record of these important changes, but also his offer of June '49 to make certain "alterations in the operas" for Weimar (278 *ant.*): plainly he intended at that date to redemand from Leipzig his amended *Dutchman* score, but Weimar's indifference towards the work put him quite out of conceit with it, and the whole affair passed from his mind, only to be revived in part by this recent discovery.

After employing the Dresden theatre's 1846 score and band-parts for his Zurich *Dutchman* week in '52, Wagner returns them in May and begs Uhlig to make that '46 revision his model in lieu of the less thorough retouching sent him some six weeks previously—with one most vital exception, namely the peroration of the overture, and its corollary the close of the whole work; item, any other stray passages which he might find more maturely treated in the recent revision.† The item shews what confidence he reposed in his disciple's acumen: on Uhlig he could implicitly rely, to see these amendments duly carried out, though they might have perplexed an ordinary copyist.

Accordingly, when Liszt writes midway in that same May '52, "It is not my fault that I could not fly to your Flying Dutchman; how heartily it would have rejoiced me to see you again, and what high enjoyment your splendid work would have given me, I have no need to tell you, most excellent friend. The accounts that have reached me from various quarters, about your representations of the Flying Dutchman, could not help being very

---

* "Dr" Schmidt is mentioned in the letter of Apr. 9, '52, as the Leipzig manager to whom the revised score was sent in 1846. Another Schmidt, however, is mentioned in this letter of July 15, '52; namely, Gustav Schmidt, who is about to produce *Tannhäuser* at Frankfort. It therefore is possible that Wagner here refers to the latter, of whom he had just been talking, though a "—" detaches the one paragraph from the other. In any case, I think that *Uhlig* meant the Leipzig Schmidt and the *Holländer* score.

† April 9, '52, only a fortnight after despatch of the previous model, Uhlig had already been forewarned of this change of plan.

agreeable to me. Next winter you shall have news of our production from Weimar too, as we mustn't delay any longer, and I hope it will be a success on the company's side (for the work itself stands beyond all question). Be so good as to let me know as soon as possible the precise alterations, abridgments and expansions [!] you have effected in the score, since I want to get the parts copied out at once . . . So write me my needful instructions for getting up the Flying Dutchman, and rest assured that I shall not depart from them by a hair's breadth"—Wagner answers, "Simply send your [here and in the next clause "thy," for once] score to *Uhlig:* he is in possession of the score I lately revised, and will get yours arranged in strict accord with it. When the time for rehearsals draws near, I will give you due notice of details [the *Remarks*]: for the present my mind will be at ease if the parts are written out after the *Uhlig* score, and the mise-en-scène got up from the sketches you will receive" (May 29, '52); and six weeks later, "Uhlig will put the score right for you, as soon as he receives yours" (*die Eurige*, 2nd person plural). Unfortunately, viewing the score left at Weimar since 1849 as his private property, therefore perhaps not caring to have it tampered with, Liszt must have written to Uhlig in a directly opposite sense; for we find Wagner replying to U. Aug. 9, '52, "Yes, *do* get the Dresden score of the Holländer sent to Weimar after all (*besorge doch ja*) for the correction: it is *of the utmost moment to me!*" Far better, had Liszt but done as he was asked; that sending of the Dresden '46 score to Weimar formed the commencement of a wellnigh inextricable muddle.

By August 23 it has safely reached Weimar a few days since, for Liszt writes Wagner: "As you already know, the Flying Dutchman is set down for the Grand Duchess's next birthday, February the 16th ('53). It will be our endeavour to stage and mount this opera properly. Zigesar is quite in love with your genius, and goes to the task with much zeal and affection.—The corrected score was put in the copyists' hands at once, and in 6 weeks the rehearsals shall begin *comme il faut.*" Naturally Wagner would conclude that the corrections were being copied into the aforesaid Weimar score; but, as we soon shall see, it was simply the *parts* that were being extracted and copied out.

Then (how soon after, is undeterminable) Uhlig sent the '52 Zurich revision to Weimar as well, since that would be needed

for the overture and closing pages. Probably at the same time he also sent the Leipzig score, and asked for the Dresden one back; for Liszt writes Wagner next January, "The earlier confusion that arose from Dresden, through the sending and sending back of Holländer-scores, led me to suppose that Uhlig had made a second mistake" (287 *inf.*). Clearly, punctilious Uhlig had not even made a first mistake (*irre geworden*), but, the Dresden-theatre people having made a fuss about their score having gone on another journey, he had to redemand it and lend Weimar the reclaimed Leipzig one instead. As these two were to all practical intents the same, that would make no difference, save for its distracting influence on the Weimar copyists, whom Liszt elsewhere describes as incompetent; but the long and short of it is this:—Instead of the Weimar score being properly amended under the vigilant eye of Uhlig at Dresden, as Wagner had desired, the Weimar copyists have to flounder as best they may with two separate models, the application whereof not a soul in that small capital appears to have understood; Uhlig, on the other hand, is kept without the material for preparing a standard score for the use of *other* theatres—a very serious matter, as we have seen how his days were then numbered.

At last, not having heard from Liszt for a couple of months, Wagner can rest patient no longer, and writes him half-a-dozen lines Dec. 22: "Merely a *pressing* request for to-day. Do get the Holländer-scores, after which the Weimar one has been set right, despatched to Uhlig at Dresden *post-haste*. Breslau has already been waiting very long for a copy to be likewise arranged in accord therewith. Please, please, have this seen to *at once*.—Next week you shall have my Remarks" etc.; and he repeats the petition, two days later, as a second theatre, that of Schwerin, is also waiting for the first requirement of a coming production. Liszt replies Dec. 27, "The Flying Dutchman will go off to Uhlig tomorrow. I could not possibly send it earlier, as our copyings are done with the most wearisome dilatoriness.—The delay in this return is therefore no fault of mine, for I have been urging it daily. Already I have held the first 2 pfte rehearsals of the Flying Dutchman, and can guarantee you a successful representation on the 16th February."

Fresh terror lurks in that first "it," though Wagner does not

notice it yet, for he writes old Fischer Jan. 2, '53: "You know of Uhlig's illness, and can well imagine how it pains me to trouble him with commissions now. But a horrible confusion has occurred: Breslau and Schwerin are anxiously waiting for a *rectified* score of the Holländer; for that 'rectification' two model scores were needful, after one of which the overture and the instrumental close of the last act, after the other the whole remainder of the instrumentation, were to be corrected. *Both* scores lay hitherto at Weimar, in order that the score there might be rectified in accord with them; when *Uhlig* asked for them back, folk dilly-dallied there (*wurde dort getrödelt*), and only a few days since did Liszt inform me that they would go off. I assume, at all events, that they have reached Dresden by now . . . [long directions: Breslau to be sent the Leipzig score now, Schwerin to have a copy corrected after the Dresden duplicate; but, for both—] the *overture* and *instrumental close* of act iii must be *specially* rectified according to *that* score which I sent to Uhlig from Zurich a year ago (N.B. this change is contained in neither the second Dresden nor the Leipzig score). A correct standard-copy, also a spare theatre-copy, must then be got ready at once," since, "please God, this opera also will be more widely given."

Here everything is clear as daylight, or as all Wagner's departmental transactions. But poor Uhlig—died while that letter was still en route, in fact the day after it was written, and can scarcely have even been shewn the score despatched to him by Liszt Dec. 28. Thus we have no external proof as to *which* of the two (the '46 or the '52 revision) still remained at Weimar, since Wagner himself must have been in the dark on this point when he wrote Fischer again Jan. 8. Fischer, on the other hand, *before* receipt of Wagner's letter of the 2nd, must have been handed by Uhlig's widow that score which Liszt had sent, and at once have conveyed to Wagner the sad tidings and a request for enlightenment. So Wagner writes Jan. 8, as said: "You will have received my lines of Jan. 2 by now, and thereby the affair of the scores will have already become quite clear to you.—I'm writing again at once to Liszt about the second score, in which I *considerably* recast the overture (particularly the closing section), and in correspondence therewith the close of the last finale, a year ago. Meanwhile it would be well to inquire if this score is not at Uhlig's after all. . . . L[iszt] has

caused me a hideous confusion!!" The situation as regards Breslau and Schwerin would have been desperate indeed, had it not suddenly occurred to Wagner that the score sold to the Zurich theatre last year might itself have been thoroughly corrected before this confusion arose. Most luckily, it had; he is able to borrow it, and next day sends Fischer his final instructions, rounded off by an ejaculation with which we can heartily sympathise: "I'm perfectly miserable about the awful delay through this dilly-dallying; the Breslau production was to have been the middle of this very month, and that *alone* is to blame!!"*

The "confusion" at Weimar, however, was still in its prime. Wagner writes Liszt most circumstantially and plainly Jan. 8, '53, "Has the *overture* and *close of the last finale* of the 'Flying Dutchman' not really been revised by your people according to a *special* score I arranged last year? In particular the *closing movement* of the overture was *entirely* altered by me in its instrumentation: the score containing *this* change I sent a year ago to Uhlig; he wrote me that he had forwarded it to Weimar *with* a *second* score (which contained the revision of the rest of the instrumentation). Just ask H. B. You *must* have received two scores. Do look in your [plural "*Eurer*" underlined] theatre-score: if the closing movement of the overture is *notably* recast there, and in particular if an extra bar has been inserted on page 43,—then your [plural again] score *has* likewise been amended after a second score sent you,—and the model copy *must* still be among you † (for in the Dresden score the close of the overture was only superficially altered—in the violins a little)." To make it still plainer, he repeats these details in a précis, and begs Liszt, in case that second score (with its landmark, "*an extra bar*") is really not at Weimar, to write and ask Fischer at once to supply the material for "this *momentous* alteration."

Nothing could possibly be more lucid: the Yes or No could be

---

* Breslau did come off Jan. 26, but Schwerin not till April 6 (both 1853, of course).

† As it is an important point, I must again remark that Wagner could only *guess* which score had been returned to Uhlig's deathbed. His guess I believe to have been wrong; but if anyone in authority at Weimar had troubled personally to inspect the borrowed scores some time before, or even in the act of returning one, the confusion could never have arisen.

ascertained in a twinkling by presence or absence of the landmark twice-specified; wherefore the very first sentence in Liszt's reply of the 12th prepares us for breakers ahead: "After much inquiring, pondering and searching, the affair of the *Fliegender Holländer* scores turns out to be as follows"—not a syllable about that extra bar on p. 43, one way or the other. But the continuation is absolutely staggering: "The score with the corrected close in the overture and at end of the opera is the same which you left me here as a present.* I never dreamt of using it for the production here, and therefore wrote Uhlig shortly before his death (which has much grieved Hans and myself) that he was mistaken in redemanding 2 theatre-scores from us, as we necessarily needed *one* here and the other was already sent to him. Uhlig does not appear to have known that one exemplar of the 3 scores that lay here for some time was my personal property, and on my part I could not admit that he was justified in describing my exemplar as a theatre-score." The next sentence, about the "earlier confusion," I have already cited (284 *ant.*); it is followed thus: "Your letter of to-day explains the whole thing, and I promise you that by tomorrow evening our theatre-score shall be amended in exact accord with my exemplar, and the day after tomorrow I will send Fischer my own exemplar (with the newly-corrected close of the overture &c.). You may set your mind quite at ease about it, and use this score however you like.—Please excuse these delays. Musikdirektor Götze, who has to attend to these score-arrangements, has been much kept from his work these last months † . . . and your letter has first made the thing clear to me, namely that you wish to dispose of my exemplar, which is heartily at your service."

From anyone but Liszt, the above might have lashed its recipient into a fury, since it turns everything topsy-turvy, yet blandly assumes that all is quite clear now. But Liszt seems to have suffered from a none-too-rare mental defect, best describable as detail-blindness. Among the several probabilities there was

---

* "Die Partitur mit dem corrigirten Schluss in der Ouvertüre und am Ende der Oper ist dieselbe, welche Du mir als Geschenk hier überlassen hast."

† Dots in the German edition of the *Corr.* here, suggesting some private communication.

one impossibility, and he plumps for that: whatever else might be the case, the score left at Weimar since 1849 could never be that which Wagner revised "a year ago," i.e. in 1852! Moreover, on one occasion only (283 *ant.*) had Wagner unheedingly spoken of the Weimar score with a "thy"; on every other it is a consistently plural "your," and from the first we have seen that it was destined for that *theatre*. Had Liszt entertained any doubt on the subject—and doubt at least he should have felt—nothing could have been simpler than to ask Wagner himself, some weeks since, and the difficulty would have been settled at once by his receiving a duplicate.

Now, if the said Weimar score (regarded by Liszt as his "personal property") was *not* to be desecrated by use for the production, it would of course not get revised; certainly not in the late pressure of business. Then what about those other two, the two which Uhlig had sent? They differed, as we know: if the parts were being copied from the one—or even from a medley of both of them—how could the performance be conducted from the other? Wagner himself had found this wellnigh impossible, last year. A still ghastlier thought: was one of these invaluable pattern scores being "corrected" by those Weimar copyists who had so clearly been abandoned to their own devices? The situation teems with possibilities of irreparable mischief; whilst the only person at Weimar who might have steered the vessel clear, in the scanty leisure left him by 8 hours' daily practice for his virtuoso start in life, was set the task of rearranging the princess's library and teaching her daughter Spanish.*

Our saddest reflection is the effect all this pother must have had on dying Uhlig, who can but have foreseen the issue from the first: let us hope the aforesaid missive was withheld from that faithful sufferer to whom Wagner so touchingly apologised for so much as writing him at all (iii, 456, 463). There again the dramatist was a better realiser than the pure-musician. Nor has

* See *Bülow's Briefe* I. 481, 484, 489, 501, 504. Among them, Hans to his father Nov. 13, '52: "This last week I have been entrusted by Liszt with a musical task [revising *Cellini?*] at which I have often sat late into the night, and which must be finished by the beginning of next week—how, I don't know—when Berlioz arrives to attend the performances of his opera and to conduct a concert." No mention of the *Holländer* anywhere in this part of the volume.

this contention about *meum* and *nostrum* been laid without leaving a permanent scar on that poem which ended with a deprecation of all worldly goods. Among the worries distracting its author's mind during that poem's final process, this, coupled as it was with Uhlig's death, takes first unfortunate place. Apart from unrecorded letters to the impatient theatres themselves, it figures in those of all the following dates:—to Uhlig, Dec. 23 and 24; to Liszt, Dec. 22 and 24, Jan. 8 and 13; to Fischer, Jan. 2, 8, 9 and 21—ten letters on a topic that would have righted itself almost automatically last summer, had Weimar not interfered; ten letters eating into the heart of the Ring-poem's preparation for the printer.

And the worst of it is, that all these pains were manifestly thrown away, so far as concerns Weimar. "Do set that matter straight with the close of the 'Flying Dutchman' overture. If one of the scores has gone astray (a rather serious loss to me), tell Fischer and he'll supply you with the close: but on *no* account give the overture without that alteration," writes Wagner to Liszt Jan. 13, '53, *before* he has received Liszt's letter of the 12th. "I'm sending you one further change herewith. You'll soon find out where it belongs. The brass and drums had too coarse, too material an effect here: one should be startled by Senta's cry at sight of the Hollander—not by drums and brass." That change indeed Liszt adopted, but you will now have no difficulty in guessing that he was in complete ignorance of the real alteration in the overture, perhaps in the rest of the work, when he wrote Jan. 23: "All your changes in the score of the Flying Dutchman have been studiously copied out in the parts, and I shall not forget the *pizzicato* last sent me."*

Ere probing that important matter of the overture, it will be a relief to turn to the opening sentence of this last letter of Liszt's: "For your more than royal gift I cannot thank you otherwise than by accepting it with the deepest and most sacred joy. You yourself will best judge the feelings that overcame me on arrival of your splendid presents, so that I greeted the 3 scores with my

* In the *Bayr. Bl.* 1887, p. 331, Felix Mottl reproduces this bar, from a loose sheet of manuscript preserved in the Wagner museum: the scoring is only for flutes, oboes, clarinets in A, bassoons, horns in G, and strings—one quaver.

eyes full of tears!—The Florentines once bore Cimabue's Madonna in triumph through their city to the ringing of bells: would it were granted me to prepare a like festival for your works and you!—Meanwhile the 3 scores shall rest with me in a quite special niche to themselves, and when I come to you, I will tell you more about it. All three works must first of all be decently performed here." What those "3 scores" were, we know, as they are mentioned in Liszt's Will of 1860: "The manuscript scores, in Wagner's hand, of *Lohengrin* and the *Fliegender Holländer*, with the autographed one of *Tannhäuser* that rests in the same casket. A present from Wagner."* The present—probably in the binder's hands then—had been dimly foreshadowed Jan. 8, the very day of Wagner's forlorn message to Fischer: it must have been actually despatched just after receipt of Liszt's perfectly hopeless letter of Jan. 12!

Liszt, Feb. 18, '53: "Hans sent you yesterday a circumstantial report on our first representation of the Flying Dutchman.—The performance was satisfactory, and its success, as I had reason to anticipate—decidedly warm and sympathetic. The two Mildes have done their utmost to obtain full recognition for the rôles of the Hollander and Senta—and they completely succeeded too.—The overture roared and crashed superbly (*tobte und krachte superb*); so that, in spite of its being the custom not to applaud on the Grand Duchess's fête-day, there was enthusiastic clapping of hands and shouting Bravo.—Our orchestra stands on a good footing now, and as soon as the 5 or 6 engagements which I proposed some time ago, have been effected, it will be able to boast itself among the best in Germany. . . . My heartiest thanks, best friend, for all the delight your Holländer gives me; at Zurich next summer we will have a chat or two about it." Hans' report we do not possess,† but unless he had been shewn the *triad* of

---

* One of Liszt's bequests to Pss Carolyne for her lifetime, thereafter to his daughters (only the younger of whom survived him).—The *Tannhäuser* score be it said, was the nearest approach to an original autograph that Wagner could bestow, done as it was by a 'process' at the first (see ii, 87-8).

† There is a soupçon of it in Wagner's letter to Liszt of March 3, '53: "In the ghost-scene of the third act of the Flying Dutchman *you* should have cheerfully cut"—the very scene the essay so admires for its din!

scores two months ago, he would be unable to say anything decisive about the overture, as he had left Zurich a year before the '52 revision was carried out. Liszt's "toben und krachen," however, is ominous enough in itself; the more so, as nothing is said of the overture's new close.

Which form of the overture had Liszt conducted? It is no idle question, as some of the consequences abide with us still. Run your eye down a few of Wagner's expressions in this regard: —"The close of the overture always annoyed me much at the old performances"; "A year ago I *considerably* recast the overture (*bedeutend* umgebildet habe), particularly the closing section, and in correspondence therewith the close of the last finale"; "This change is contained in neither the second Dresden nor the Leipzig score"; "In the Dresden score only the violins were altered a little"; "This *momentous* change" (*wichtige* Aenderung); "On *no* account give the overture without it." From all these observations—and there are others only less emphatic—it is manifest that the new form of the overture must have been distinguishable from the old at a glance, needed no brain-racking inquiries at Weimar. Whether Liszt had ever tried the overture through with his orchestra in earlier years or not, he must now have seen at once that this "newly corrected" form was something radically different. On this ground alone, then, we may be sure that the model score of '52, embodying that vital change, was the one returned to Uhlig Dec. 28; also, that it was returned without Liszt's having ever examined it. The other score, which he returned to Fischer mid-January '53, unaccountably mistaking it for a four-year-old personal gift, would accordingly be the lately-reclaimed Leipzig score of 1846: from this intermediate and "superficial" revision of the overture the virgin score that had reposed on its Weimar shelf since '49 must have been hurriedly "rectified" on receipt of Wagner's letter of Jan. 8, '53.

In light of that inference we will return to cap. 2 of Carolyszt's essay, and shall now discover how blindly its description of the overture has been extolled by people who never took the trouble to compare it with the modern score. Apart from Carolyne's tropes—highly poetical, no doubt—Liszt's musical exegesis is based on the obsolete Dresden form! Try to follow it with the modern score, or even with the recollection of a hearing thereof, and you will rub both eyes and ears in amazement.

Small points to start with, yet points from which we already may glean some notion of the older form:—*a*) The first theme (Hollander) is correctly assigned in this essay to horns and bassoons, but "at the sixth bar the tremolo of the violins is reinforced by chromatic surging up and down (*Auf- und Abwogen*) of the cellos and violas." In the modern score the violas *share* in the tremolo of the violins till the end of the ninth bar, whereas it is the cellos and double-basses that enter at the sixth with a chromatic ascending scale, and not before the tenth bar do the basses drop out and the violas combine with the cellos to carry it still *higher:* no downward motion at all here, till after the second appearance of the Hollander theme; it is the rising wind, not "the waves" (the latter have a figure of their own—see p. 276 *ant.*—which makes no entry before bar 26). Plainly the instrumentation, possibly also a detail of the figuration, differed in the earlier score.—*b*) The first long *diminuendo*, ending with a general pause at bar 64, is described as "rounding off the exposition-act of the instrumental drama": an obvious misnomer, as the antithesis, Senta or Redemption theme, has yet to be introduced with bar 65; a reference to Wagner's own Programme (published *N. Z.* Aug. 5, '53; see also 247*n ant.*) would have shewn the analyst that the "exposition" does not really end until bar 96, when the Dutch crew "in dumb toil have brought the ship to rest" (*P.* III. 228), followed by *Tempo primo* bar 97. A curious feature is the recognition of the descending sequence for trombones, "which recurs in the first act when the phantom-ship furls its blood-red sails for its last landing," coupled with non-recognition of the characteristic little theme which accompanies that furling; true, it is mentioned here, or rather, in the preceding sentence, but thus: "cries escape from the horns, like the last sighs of a vanishing grief," whereas that highly distinctive *cor anglais*—which Liszt, of course, could never confound with the 'French' horn—is not referred to at all. That 'English horn' we may accordingly claim as a second fruit of the '52 revision.—*c*) "After seventy bars of a grandiose, fantastic fortissimo, painted in bold strokes as if *al fresco*, we hear one of those rhythms draw nearer and nearer, wherewith seamen are wont to accompany their manœuvres." The section is unmistakable, beginning with the aforesaid *Tempo primo* (bar 97) and ending at letter E, between bars 168 and 169. Turning to the score, instead of "seventy

bars of fortissimo" we simply find one stretch of five bars (129-33) and another of eight (140-7) where the fortissimo is unbroken, and six passages where the *ff* lasts for just two bars—25 bars in all, in lieu of "seventy" *; all the rest of the section is perpetually dropping to *piano* or gradually mounting therefrom! To be sure, a page earlier this selfsame section had been designated "a prodigiously swelling crescendo"; but even that will by no means fit so carefully graded a piece of chiaroscuro. One's thoughts fly back at once to the "toben und krachen," and the nature of the Weimar "corrections" stands self-confessed: that they were not based on the '52 revision, we may be positive when we look at Wagner's letter to Fischer of Jan. 9, '53 (no. 20) and note his anxiety that his new marks of expression should be most carefully copied into the scores for other theatres.

Under a different category come apparent failures to seize the plain import of melodic reminiscences—if I may use the term in the sense that an overture, like a preface, is written *after* the work it introduces—motives undoubtedly shared by the earliest and the latest scores. Were this a mere impressionist record, it would be another matter; but when the ordinary sober language of the musical analyst is blent with that impressionism, we look for much closer correspondence between picture and object. Hence, the said "prodigious crescendo" having been ushered in by specific mention ("first violins, flutes and oboes") of the

* Seventy-two bars, to be exact; but the "seamen's rhythm," i.e. the labour-theme of the Norwegian crew, had really begun at bar 161, thus rounding off another section of 64 bars: so that from the first note of the overture down to this point we have 64+32+64, in absolute symmetry of arrangement, and perfect multiples of the traditional 16. As for the "seamen's rhythm" itself (267 *ant.*), to derive it from the "werden" and "Erden" in Senta's ballad, as some have done, simply shews how little regard is usually paid to its proper phrasing (possibly owing to an acquaintance based on the pfte): it is a realistic "nature-sound," the sailors' "Ho!" with a catch in the breath before the next aspirate. One is surprised that Liszt should have missed its subtle differentiation into major and minor according as it typifies the flesh-and-blood Norwegian and the phantom Dutch crew; but he has also missed their other cries (occurring in this overture too), the octave common to both, and the human 'fourth' of Daland's men, against the shrill 'fifth' of the Hollander's half-ghosts. Attention to these and other illuminating details would have saved his analysis from much confusion; though I must once more caution the reader of German that the musical illustrations in the 1881 edition, now and then contradicting the text, are none of his choosing.

melody that will hereafter accompany the Hollander's first utterance of "Wie oft im Meeres tiefsten Schlund," we have a right to expect some notice of its equally important pendant,* the phrase in which those words themselves are clothed at their *second* utterance, a phrase that forms the backbone of those "undefinable harmonies and mysterious rhythms" toward the end of the "seventy bars of fortissimo"; more especially as these two phrases recur in close connection, though inverse order, after the very next outburst of the Hollander theme (letter G in the score, bar 219 *et seq.*). Neither of the twain is mentioned in the latter instance, and in fact the whole main body of the music gets swallowed in a whirlpool of vocables through blindness to its graphic tale. Immediately after the full theme of the Sailors' song, we are told that "an echo of the Senta-phrase emerges here and there, as if seeking to escape from this chaos of destruction where abysses open and close," and so on; yet, if you have ears you will know that those echoes come not from the "Senta-phrase" at all, but from the Sailors' song itself. At first I took this for a mere misprint, until I had struggled through another dozen lines and lit on the following: "Raging, the battle of the waves goes on, whilst the Senta-phrase wanders lost, persecuted, rejected, but ever returning like an angel of light . . . with dripping wings." Frankly, there is neither head nor tail to be made of it; and just because the plainest thematic indications are butchered to make a Carolynian holiday.—Place Wagner's concise Programme before your mental eye, and you have all the difference between an achromatic lens and a piece of tourmalin: never was story more clearly told by instruments alone; you can see the Dutchman's ship pursuing Daland's and scaring its crew out of their wits, while they try to keep their courage up by snatches from their song, their "Ho!" and their "Hallohe"; and you can hear their shout and "rhythm" even after the "Senta" (Redemption) theme has really made its luminous re-entry (no "echo"), as if the composer were confiding to you that through *this* last chase of the Hollander's he would reach his final haven.

Not one hint of this important episode is contained in the

* Palpably built on the theme to which are set the first articulate words of the Ballad: "Traft ihr das Schiff im Meere an."

page * of tall talk that separates the essay's last mention of the dripping angel from the "violent explosion" that serves for another landmark: "Old ocean is amazed . . . majestic and melancholy gliding . . . sails limp as a careless-donned purple . . . tired of the weight of its bowsprit, like a man inebriated more by sorrows than by wine, the ship reels on," etc., etc.—It being quite impossible to find one's bearings here, one turns with a sense of deep relief to Wagner's authorised Programme: "A ray divides the gloom of night; like a lightning-flash it quivers through his tortured soul. It fades and flashes up again: fixing his gaze on the lodestar, the seaman stoutly steers towards it through the billows. What draws him with such might is a woman's glance, that, full of lofty sadness and divine compassion, pierces to him through the storm! A heart has opened its unending depths to the measureless sorrows of the damned: it must sacrifice itself for him, must break of very sympathy, to end his sufferings with its existence. At this godlike vision the fated man breaks down at last, as the timbers of his ship are shivered. It the ocean's trough engulfs; but he, he rises whole and hallowed from the waves, led in triumph at the rescuing hand of his redemptrix to the flushing daybreak of sublimest love" (*P.* III. 229). No persecuted angel here, but a beacon—a revolving beacon, if you insist on the "fading and flashing up again." Wagner does not foolishly attempt to explain his tone-poem bar by bar; his elucidation of the whole overture would barely cover the present page, against Carolyszt's eight; wisely he leaves the hearer to fill in details for himself. Nevertheless, the point where the ship hurls itself on destruction is past mistake: the Hollander theme breaks suddenly short on a chord of the diminished seventh, followed by a two-bar pause, whereon the tempo changes to *Vivace* and that chord flies asunder; we have arrived at the "peroration" so often referred-to above. Let us see what Liszt makes of it—and I say "Liszt" advisedly, for it is easy to sift his technical remarks from Carolyne's hyperboles:—

* In the opening sentence of the long paragraph on p. 169 of the '81 edition, "The Curse-motive returns in its full intensity (orchestral score p. 40)," the bracketed clause is a misleading interpolation of L. R.'s, herself misled by the perplexing clues. Manifestly Liszt meant bars 219-26 (letter G in the full score, already mentioned by me above), *not* bars 301-4, which latter end with the "explosion" preceding the peroration.

"Thus the Hollander sails through the waves, when a violent explosion, as of a sudden breaker, drives the ship against its destined reef with a blow that shatters it at last. Sudden silence; all round reign fear and stupefaction. Then, like a thousand winged arrows, the violins storm up in sevenths. The melody of the ballad shines, glimmers (*flimmert*), steps forth and draws nigh —a brilliant meteor. The new final-rhythm (*Finalrhythmus*), borne on which it now appears, is the same that accompanies the words in the opera: 'Ich sei's, die dich durch ihre Treu' erlöse! Mög' Gottes Engel mich dir zeigen! Durch mich sollst du das Heil erreichen!'* and is repeated at the end of the opera when the final apotheosis shews the Hollander and his angel of rescue risen from the waves of the sea to the glory of Heaven. The tempo in which this musical thought first appeared lent it the character of elegiac plaint, of infinite pity and compassion; but the later heroic and glowing rhythm transforms it to a kind of victorious fanfare, an exulting hymn of jubilation. One might remark a certain analogy between the peroration of this overture and that of Der Freischütz, in which the motive from Agathe's great aria is likewise resumed with accelerated rhythm, as if shafts of light were woven to a crown set with stars for the deification of love." Then, arriving in cap. 5 at the close of the opera itself: "The phantom-ship sinks in the waves. Soon thereafter we see the heavens opened and wondrous bright; Senta and the Redeemed, surrounded with an aureole, appear in the clouds, and form the nucleus of a Northern Light, while the orchestra takes up the ballad-motive in D major, as if all grief were expiate and blown away, to a hymn-like rhythm just like the peroration of the overture."

Now we know exactly where we are. The very attempt to make this description rhyme with the modern close, either of

---

* Of the corresponding passage in act ii the essay remarks (cap. 4) that Senta sings these words "in the enhanced rhythm, already known to us from the peroration of the overture, of that oft-heard phrase 'Doch kann dem bleichen Manne Erlösung einstens noch werden.'" Precisely what is meant, in the abstract, by an "enhanced rhythm" (*gesteigerten Rhythmus*) it would puzzle a philologist to say, even with L. R.'s addition of "now, however," (*jetzt jedoch gesteigerten*). In plain terminology, the 6/4 becomes 'common time,' and instead of the crotchet's value being 100, that of the minim becomes 92—only 88 and 80, "however," at end of the Ballad.

overture or opera, made me suspect that a good deal more than instrumentation had been involved in what Wagner described as a "*momentous* change." It was manifest that the old form must have been much noisier in its general build, to be compared at all with the close of *Der Freischütz*. For one thing, those ten bars of *poco ritenuto* could not have existed as its last word, if it ended with a "crown of stars" or "a kind of victorious fanfare, an exulting hymn of jubilation" (*in eine Art Siegesfanfare, in einen Hymnus des Jauchzens und Frohlockens*). It must have been that final jubilation which "so much annoyed" Wagner in the earlier form. So I tried to get a glimpse of the old score.

Unfortunately, our national copy at the British Museum was not acquired till 1877, and is of a highly composite nature, the overture, Spinning-chorus, and Norwegian Sailors' chorus being engraved, the remainder lithographed. Consequently the full score of the overture could not help me, in this question, as it presents the modern form. But our Museum does possess an early edition of the vocal score, and there I found the termination alike of overture and opera in the very closest accord with Liszt's description: the peroration of the *Freischütz* overture might well have been, most probably was, the archetype for this. Once the "jubilation" has started, it continues to the end of the overture; the whole thing is either *sempre forte* or *ff*, a mere expansion of Senta's outburst at the conclusion of her Ballad, with the Hollander theme bringing up the rear in D major, followed by a few sforzando scales and the usual working of the common chord to a 'full close' (for 7 bars).* In this earliest vocal score the instrumental close of the opera is not an *absolute* replica of that of the overture: on the one hand, it is considerably shorter; on the other, its last 14 bars (interspersed with rests) do not depart from the common chord of D major, which enters with the Hollander theme, even by way of passing notes, as bars 4 to 9 of the overture's last 16 had done; moreover it abides by 'common time,' even for that Hollander-theme itself (its sole appearance in that guise), whereas the overture's last 16 had

* I had thought of reproducing this peroration in my Appendix, but Messrs Novello have spared me that expense: they *still* publish their vocal score with the antiquated endings in both places; a musical curiosity I advise the reader to secure ere this enterprising firm withdraws it in favour of an up-to-date edition.

reverted to 6/4. But the general effect is the same; if anything, still noisier. Should you object that Liszt had said "just like (*ganz gleich* *) the peroration of the overture," I would reply 1) He was speaking of what he called the "hymn-like rhythm," the meaning whereof is to be gathered from his "Hymnus des Jauchzens und Frohlockens"; 2) We have found his analysis a trifle loose in other places. Per contra, his analogy from the close of the *Freischütz* overture alone would pin him to the older form, even if we neglected a still more cogent argument.

Is it conceivable that anyone should have conducted this overture a dozen times—a number we may safely subsume for its rehearsals and performances between Jan. '53 and July '54—without being struck by the most salient feature of its modern aspect? Must he not have been bound to remark that wonderful passage, so distinct from anything else in the work, where the harp makes its appearance? The mere fact of that instrument's not being mentioned once in all the essay, would be ample proof that Liszt had not even yet made acquaintance with the modern close, which with the harp's first entry acquires a wholly different *form*, not merely an improved scoring, from that of yore.

Hark back to the landmark in Wagner's letter of Jan. 8, '53 (to Liszt—see 286 *ant.*): "an extra bar inserted on page 43" of the lithographed score,† his specified token of the 1852 model.

---

* The "ganz" has been cancelled by L. R. (p. 232 of the '81 edition), but the remainder of the description not corrected, merely anagrammed.

† Jan. 9 to Fischer: "It would be best to have the close of the *Overture* and of the last *Finale* written *afresh*. It is not much: 8 pages in the overture —from p. 43 onward—and 5 pages in the finale—from p. 409 onward." In our Museum copy the two bars of A *ff* in the Finale (see above) open p. 112 of act iii, not "p. 409," the litho-plates having clearly been renumbered, beginning afresh with each act. This renumeration probably resulted from the engraving for separate use of those choruses which respectively commence the last two acts, and there is reason to believe that at least the Norwegian Sailors' chorus was issued thus quite early in the fifties (letter to U., Dec. 51). Further, the litho act iii is manifestly by a different copyist, therefore presumably later than acts i and ii; certainly later on the ground of presenting the modern close, unless we are to suppose the *whole* score to have been re-lithoed toward the end of the fifties, when the stock of first impressions appears to have run out (to Liszt, May 57). But Meser's ultimate successor, Adolph Fürstner (Berlin)—who published a Partitur engraved throughout in 1897—is not a hopeful source of information here, as he recently alarmed me by confessing ignorance of Wagner's having *ever* revised the *Dutchman* scoring ! ! !

In absence of the earlier full-score of this overture I cannot dogmatise as to the position of that bar; but in the modern engraved edition the last bar on page 43 is bar 25 of the *Vivace*, the last bar of direct parallelism between the two forms (*ff*, its top note a C natural), the harp passage commencing with bar 26: count 16 bars back from that, and you reach *two* bars of a loud A, tremolo—in the old vocal score there stands but *one*. These correspond with the two bars of A *ff* immediately after that change of key-signature which heralds the close of the opera itself; wherefore I think it extremely likely that by the said "extra" or "new" bar Wagner meant this doubling of the original single bar of A, and that the engraved form has simply taken a page or so less than the lithograph to arrive at the stated situation. Between this A and bar 26 comes the "triumphant" metamorphosis of the "Senta" or Redemption-motive, common to the earlier and later scores, where the '52 change can have consisted in no more than a richer instrumentation and a grading from *p dolce* to *ff*; but with bar 26 itself an altogether novel spirit comes o'er the dream. For one-and-twenty bars, totally different from the original twenty, we are transported to a country hardly dreamt of in the 'forties; a whole series of prismatic modulations wafts us to those regions whence Isolde's death-song shall a few years hence float down, sphere telling sphere its story. *This* no longer is a jubilation conceivably to be dubbed a "victorious *fanfare*," even by Pss Wittgenstein. It is the overcoming of all earthly triumphs.

Again, after bar 47 has brought us back to common ground with the older form, the resumption of the 6/4 beat gives the Hollander-theme a figure of accompaniment which it apparently lacked in the earliest score, a figure significantly derived from the subsidence of the storm in the first scene of act i. Continued for ten bars, i.e. for six bars after the Hollander-theme has lost all recognisability by transforming itself into mere pedal-notes of the major triad, this figure is probably that "slight alteration" made at Dresden "for the violins" in '46, since its six bars of preponderance take the place of the sforzando scales already mentioned. Both old and new forms complete this passage with two bars of tremolo, the bass of the new reproducing that of the old (simply D, dotted semibreve, A and F sharp, dotted minims); but there they part company once more. The old just winds up

with 4 bars and a fraction on the pedal D and its major triad; the new virtually changes its key to G major, with *Un poco ritenuto*, and reverts to the original phrasing of the Redemption-theme *p dolce*. Flattening the B of the common chord at the beginning of the fourth bar of this change, however, and thus temporarily converting the key into minor at the same time as 'duple measure' is resumed, it passes to a favourite cadence of the riper Wagner's, which, almost literally reproduced in the (presumably new) close of the *Faust* overture, actually anticipates the so-called "heroic" theme of Tristan (*T. u. I.* act i, sc. 5). Finally, as the harp—which had kept silence from the entry of the Hollander-theme till the *poco rit.*—ends its last arpeggio on the D major triad, we have two tremolo bars corresponding to the last two of the early form, but simply swelling from *p* to the *f* of the abrupt last chord, instead of one continuous *ff*.

Through those 21 bars of ethereal modulations, and these last 10 bars (strictly, 9 and a crotchet) of *poco ritenuto*, the whole trend of the overture has been spiritualised. The close of the opera itself does not adopt the group of 21, consequently neglects the 5 preceding bars—which in the overture had occurred twice over, framing in that group; otherwise it is a replica of the close of the overture, and brings the work to a solemn, rather than a jubilant end. "The daybreak of *sublimest* love" (*Morgenröthe erhabenster Liebe*), as Wagner suggests; the "still small voice," after the "great and strong wind" wherein "the Lord was not"; or perhaps a species of musical moral, a deprecation of boisterous applause.

* * *

The above, in fact the whole of this volume save its index, already stood in type, when a new collection of Wagner's letters unexpectedly cleared up one aspect of the *Dutchman* overture.

Long had I been haunted by the idea that one possibility regarding the aforesaid "close" remained open, namely that it might have been revised yet again ere the French edition of the vocal score, *ca* 1862, the earliest printed record of its modern form. Toward the end of June 1861, as Glasenapp informs us, Wagner wrote his old Dresden friend Rühlemann, begging for a *Holländer* Partitur to be sent by Meser's successor (then Müller) for the purpose of a French translation: seeing that by the time this score arrived he had only a fortnight wherein to supervise

the translation (Nuitter), that he was in a state of complete upset then, and that he treats the matter with indifference in his letter to M. v. Meysenbug of July 26—three days before leaving Paris—we might safely dismiss all likelihood of a vital change at *that* date. Consequently there remained but the episode of his Paris and Brussels concerts in the previous year. That was an event suggesting special preparation, yet in no single account of those concerts will you find one hint of preliminary revision: even the long historical articles on the *Dutchman* in the *Bayr. Bl.* of 1901 are absolutely silent as to alteration of its prelude after 1852. I therefore felt I might lay the haunting doubt—until to-day.

March 3, 1860, Wagner writes Frau Wesendonk from Paris, "I had made a new close for the overture of the 'flying Dutchman,' which pleases me much, and also made an impression on the audience at my concerts"; and five weeks later, "Not until now that I have written Isolde's transfiguration (*letzte Verklärung*) could I find alike the right close for the Flying Dutchman overture and—also the horrors (*Grauen*) of that Venusberg. One becomes omnipotent, you see, when the World but exists as a plaything." At one stroke the mystery of those ethereal 21 bars stands self-revealed. Dr Golther, editing this new collection of letters, opines that the reference applies "in particular to the ten bars" of *poco ritenuto* at the mathematical end—an unsupported theory with which I beg to differ: these last ten bars Wagner certainly *could* have "found" even when the *Holländer* first was written; those one-and-twenty had all along astonished us by seeming anticipation of a later manner. Surely we ought not to read "Schluss" too literally here, as Wagner had constantly applied that term to the peroration as a whole, and it is just these one-and-twenty bars that transform it into an entirely new picture. As for the *ritenuto* at the actual end, with faintly possible exception of that change to minor in bars 4 and 5 of the ten (300 *ant.*), I still think it far more likely to belong to the '52 revision: at anyrate that would explain its appearance in the scenic finale without the wondrous 21—when Wagner made his last change in this overture he clearly had too much on hand to think of revising the opera itself.

But this latest discovery springs another problem on us: What was the nature of that "momentous alteration" of 1852?

Assuming the final *ritenuto* to have been written then, what can have taken the place of the original 20 bars now ousted by our 21? Here it is, that Liszt's analysis might have proved of great historic service, had he but troubled to make that comparison the material for which I still hold that he let slip through his hands. Such comparison, however, should not even now be beyond reach of the composer's countrymen, and I strongly urge that search for those scores rectified by Fischer be made at once at the Zurich, Breslau and Schwerin theatres, which we know were furnished with the '52 form—or, failing them, at Darmstadt and Frankfort (Weimar would plainly lead to fresh "confusion"). Then let the Dresden theatre's archives be explored for the original MS. and the 46 red-ink revision of the litho; and, with the final engraved form, we should have a unique demonstration of four successive stages of the same grand composition, covering a period of close upon twenty years. After that, the three phases of the opera's general instrumentation should be submitted to a similar instructive scrutiny, following the clues already indicated.

* * *

Now for Liszt's damping verdict on an overture which Wagner had taken such pains to improve for him. Directly on the heels of Carolyne's "crown set with stars" (296 *ant.*) comes the following: "Owing alike to its substance (*Inhalt*) and its form, this overture will not * attain so relatively speedy a popularity, will not be so readily acknowledged, its meaning (*Bedeutung*) so quickly seized, as might be the case with the Tannhäuser-overture and the introduction to Lohengrin. Nevertheless, this sombre picture with its lurid colours and strange contours, its thick darknesses and uncanny flashes, its painful expression of oppressive feelings (*mit seinem peinigenden, gepressten Gefühlsausdruck*), is perhaps a scarcely lesser masterpiece. But what a harrowing spectacle it unrolls before our eyes! Everything rending and snapping asunder" (with a few more lines of Carolynian tag). — Liszt's prophecy, no doubt, was true; but may it not have fulfilled itself, in a measure? The more weight

---

* *Kaum*, "scarcely," is L. R.'s substitution for the original *nicht;* conversely she drops "perhaps scarcely" (*wohl kaum*) at end of the next sentence, in favour of an unqualified "no."

one attaches to his pioneership in the case of *Lohengrin* and *Tannhäuser*, the more must one attach to the dissuasion from the *Holländer* unintentionally conveyed in these and other half-hearted sayings, which would be the first in the seething whirl of words to catch the eye of the ordinary conductor or manager.

With an essay of this length and kind, unless it is to be frankly set down as mere bavardage — "*nos fatrasies*" — we naturally assume that its author has one of two objects in view: either a serious, fearless criticism of the work discussed; or a testimonial warmly advocating that work's adoption by caterers for the public ear. For a serious judgment the first prerequisite was wanting: minute and reasoned acquaintance with all the bearings of the subject, as they stood to date. Such acquaintance—a duty Liszt owed to his signature—would of itself, in the present instance, have brought about attainment of the second object. Had Liszt but taken the composer's own Programme as text, even as a lay-figure to be hung with Carolynian draperies, the idea of there being anything difficult to seize in the "substance and form" of this overture, for instance, must have vanished as a ghost at cock-crow. Never was there grander opportunity for vindicating the right-of-existence of a genre to be hereafter so intimately associated with Liszt's name itself, that of the Symphonic Poem. Incident by incident might he have read this prelude's tale aloud, in the themes it borrows from the ensuing drama; whilst its "form" might well have been a topic for the expert's demonstration and unfaltering praise. "Formlessness" and "deafening noise" were the cries of the enemy, years before; the friend confesses "chaos" in the overture and a difficulty for the voices to assert themselves against "at many moments an overpowering orchestra"! Were it not better to impress future conductors with the pains the author since had taken to "reduce the brass, and shade it more *humanly*"? Were it not at once truer and more helpful, to proclaim to adverse critics and the world at large, that, granting the *Dutchman* had been noisy once, it was so no longer? See what a sympathetic reviewer might have advanced in favour of the work, even compared with its two fellows. Here, he could honestly have said, is an opera well within the means of the very smallest theatre: your heroic tenor is a tough bird to catch, tougher still to tame; of

passable barytone voices there are plenty, and the average owner is blest with more intelligence than any other member of an operatic company. So give this opera with but an ounce of taste and feeling, and you'll soon be turning money from your doors!

It is neither a pleasant nor a popular opinion to venture, but I am convinced that this essay of Carolyszt's, coupled with a certain lukewarmness about the work itself at Weimar, has stood more in the way of the *Holländer's* progress, from first to last, than any fulmination from the hostile camp. The opera drops out of Wagner's reckoning as a bread-winner at the very time he so much needs a third string to his bow, and less than a twelve-month from his expectation that "it also will be more widely given" (see 190 and 285 *ant.*). A little more radiant energy on Liszt's part might have tightened that third string, yet he handed his pen to a brilliant but none too tactful lady, and contented himself with a few technical interjections often wide of the mark; just as the preparations for the opera, at least so far as concerned its theatre-score, had been thrown into the background by what an eye-witness describes as the "regular racket in all connected with Liszt here."* Till just after that precious model was returned to Uhlig, demonstrably either not used at all or not used rightly, Bettina von Arnim and her two daughters had been making things what the vulgar call 'hum' at Weimar for three months past — Bettina the intellectually flighty, and causer of flightiness in others—which perhaps may account for Wagner's odd expression in the following March (228 *ant.*).

Grateful, more than grateful, as are Wagner's remarks to his friend on this essay, can one suppose him blind to its defects and their probable results? What would he have said if Franz Lachner—were such a thing imaginable—had subscribed that commentary on the *Dutchman* overture? We know what he did say about the Munich travesty of his *Tannhäuser* programme: ". . Consequently they could assure me my composition had been

* "Es ist hier bei Allem, was mit Liszt zusammenhängt, ein solches Treiben, eine wahre Hetze; ausser den ersten Abend habe ich Hans noch nicht ruhig gesprochen. Ich fürchte nur, es ist sehr anstrengend für ihn . . . es ist angenehm, aber das Leben doch sehr *décousu*": Francisca von Bülow to her daughter Sept.-Oct. '52—*Bülow's Briefe* I. 475.

thoroughly 'understood.' Isn't that delicious?" (iii, 298*n*). In Liszt's case he shut one eye to such miscomprehensions, when irrevocable,* and saw with the other rather more than the merits, for sake of the presumed intention. For ourselves, on the contrary, it is high time to cease worshipping fetishes; the sooner this strangely composite *sauce Hollandaise* is sent about its business, the sooner will Wagner's *Der fliegende Holländer* be meted that recognition for which Bayreuth has lately been the first to pave the way.

Quite seriously, in my humble opinion it is rather from the overture to this opera, and thus from Senta's Ballad, than from the whole of *Tannhäuser* and *Lohengrin*, that the musical system of the RING DES NIBELUNGEN derives. In other words, the two later operas, saving for improvements in technique, make a detour to arrive at a point already wellnigh reached direct in those former days of half-expatriation.

---

* Unlike the *Lohengrin* analysis, the *Holländer* essay was not submitted to Wagner's judgment ere its fatal plunge into print. Concerning its successor, "Liszt's" final contribution to Wagnerian literature, the brief *Rheingold* effusion appearing in the *N. Z.* Jan. 1, '55, Wagner remarks the 19th: "Your New Year's article gave me quite a fright. Yet I soon perceived that here again I really have to thank your advancing interest" etc. Next volume I hope to prove by extracts from this minor omelet that the "fright" it inspired was not unnatural; in face of Wagner's strict injunction (71 *ant.*) it ought never to have been perpetrated, and the cook in this instance, I have no hesitation in asserting, was the unaided Princess.

VII.

A BERLIN-WEIMAR COMPLICATION.

A frustrated concert-scheme; Dorn's Nibelungen *at Weimar!—Renewal of negotiations for a Berlin* Tannhäuser: *friction between Hülsen and Liszt.—Brother Albert intervenes; makes matters worse. — Olive-branch from Hülsen; Liszt rejects it: Berlin-Weimar rupture. — Wagner's real need of Berlin. — Minna's journey; her interviews with Hülsen and King of Saxony; letter to the former.—Standstill for love of Liszt.—Hülsen's "last" offer; accepted by Wagner; pique and magnanimity.—A happy ending.*

> *We will treat him handsomely.*
> R. WAGNER to LISZT, May 1854.

THERE were two subjects, as I said at the beginning of chapter VI., that would lead us more or less away from Zurich in the month's interval between the scoring of *Das Rheingold* and the composition of *Die Walküre*. In that chapter I had to look both behind and before, with the one; in the present I shall have to do much the same with the other—namely, the eternal negotiations *re* a Berlin production of *Tannhäuser*.

To restart the business fairly, I must preface it with a brief account of a generous project of Liszt's whereof we have only the faintest adumbration in his Correspondence with Wagner, to wit in Sept. '53, just before the Carlsruhe festival: "Hans has a bright idea: if Engel is so intent on getting your works spread in Berlin [102 *ant.*], or rather, on making money by them, he ought to bring off a repetition of your Zurich concerts, with the selfsame programme. There is no hurry at all, however, even about this scheme.—Under certain circumstances I am prepared to go to Berlin myself and take control of the three Zurich concerts. Probably I should make use of the men's choral union that Wieprecht conducts, whereof I have

been Honorary conductor since '43. We'll have a talk about it very soon." At Basle that October the subject was probably discussed by the whole party, and Liszt writes Bülow toward the end of November (29th?), "I accredit you afresh as my plenipotentiary in extraordinary, with the most unlimited powers to bring about a *Wagner Concert* (*exclusively* Wagner, mind you) to be given by the Männerchor-Gesang-Verein which Wieprecht conducts." It is unnecessary to quote Liszt's full instructions, covering 2½ pages in print; the following extracts will suffice:—"The programme should be modelled on those of Zurich, and I presume Wagner will lend us orchestral and vocal parts, for which he ought to be offered a respectable present in guise of fee . . . We must keep clear of 'charities,' and (after deducting expenses and the present to Wagner) the entire receipts ought to fall to the *Männerchor-Verein in honour of my Honorary conducting* . . . Perhaps one might repeat the whole concert a week later . . . more than *two* I should consider too much. But it is essential to *make sure* of one's bandsmen and singers, as it is to be feared some intrigue may circumvent the execution of this little plan . . . You will soon see if Wieprecht enters sufficiently into our ideas to prevent his being turned aside by this or that individual interested in talking him out of them."

Intrigues in the Prussian capital, you see, were suspected by Liszt as well as by Wagner. Bülow confirms the suspicion (Dec. 12): "Wieprecht will already have written you, and explained his refusal. He has sworn to me—almost with tears in his eyes—that he is so fond of you, he would readily lay down his life for you—but implores you not to insist on his doing the impossible. How strive against Hülsen, Dorn, Taubert, and above all S. M. [the King] who detests Wagner and habitually cuts out of Wieprecht's programme every scrap of the 'criminal's' music!" Wilhelm Wieprecht, inventor of the bass-tuba and radical reorganiser of military music, was Director of all the bands of the Prussian Guard, and it would appear to have been as much as his place was worth, at Court, for him to figure as promoter of such an enterprise.* Dec. 5, '53,

* Of Wieprecht—born 1802, died 1872—Tappert writes in *Die Musik* (I. no. 22) that Weber in the early twenties had much interested himself in

he writes a naïvely charming letter to Liszt, thereby proving himself a most excellent fellow. It is not an absolute "refusal," as Bülow imagined, but the good Wieprecht has his own enemies, and "might be caught in their toils" if the concert appeared to originate with him; whereas he promises to get a fine large orchestra together if only Liszt will have the thing announced as *his* affair and include a composition of his own: "That you are going to produce Dorn's opera,* has won you a large number of fresh adherents. You are loved and honoured by every musician here; and those who don't, are also not worth much, for their bad conscience is bitterly reproached by your dealings and your elevation of young talents." As for his choral union, Wieprecht says it has terribly shrunk since the troublous times of '48, but its old reputation and "your ægis" will suffice to attract not only singers, but a bumper audience, and he suggests that the surplus takings be devoted to a society under the patronage of the Prince of Prussia—manifestly to gain Court favour for the scheme.

Liszt replies to Bülow, Dec. 14, that he is ready to assume the whole responsibility, inquires about a hall and convenient

---

the ardent young musician, and thereafter "men like Spontini, Liszt, Meyerbeer, expressed their acknowledgment to him"; adding, from personal observation, that "at home and in private life the energetic 'director' was exceedingly good-natured, simple, natural, accessible"—and so one would judge from his letter. But a later number of *Die Musik* (II. no. 23) reveals the fact that "the Berlin Hofkapellmeister Dorn"—whose son here speaks—"knew well to prize the services of the conductor of his 'stage-music'; and Wieprecht was that in his civic capacity, despite his proud title of General-musikdirektor." If son Dorn's superciliousness reflects his father's, one can understand the difficulties of Wieprecht's position.—His highly-effective military arrangement of the *Rienzi* overture is probably what Bülow refers to, above. In 1846 he had been commissioned by Count Redern, Intendant of the Court-music, to arrange the March and another piece from *Tannhäuser* for the band of the Prussian Lifeguards, but, unnamed powers interfering, the pieces were regretfully returned by Redern to the composer in November of that year (see also Appendix).

* Liszt had artfully enclosed in his letter to Bülow re the Wagner-concert another to Kapellmeister Dorn, conveying him the gratifying intelligence that *his* brand-new opera *Die Nibelungen* would be produced at Weimar the end of January. Wieprecht of course does not include Dorn among the "young talents," for *he* was nine years Wagner's senior, though to survive him by seven; a fact it may be necessary to recall to the modern reader.

date, and adds: "We must mix up no sort of philanthropy in this project, but, after expenses have been handsomely paid, simply send the balance to Zurich as fee for the scores and parts that will have been lent us for the occasion." Two days later, however, he seems to have got wind of some such "intrigue" as he feared, for he tells Hans: "The Berlin concert must be postponed, in view of difficulties *beneath the surface* ["*en dessous*"] that momentarily oppose its complete success. The proverb says, 'What is deferred, is not lost'—and I quite count on a favourable occasion during the course of next year to realise this project, which there is no reason at all to abandon."

Before we hear any more (and the last) of the Berlin concert-scheme, Dorn has appeared in person at Weimar, and his appearance, I think, may project a lurid ray "beneath the surface." To heal the breach that had occurred at the beginning of the year, in the autumn of 1853 Liszt had undertaken to produce Dorn's new opera (see letter to Wagner Oct. 31). A blindfold undertaking, as the score even of the first act is not ready for inspection till December. Finesse can therefore have been the only motive for acceptance: but what a finesse! Had Dorn's opera been called by any other name, founded on any other subject, the case would have been entirely different; but, at the very moment when Liszt's bosom-friend was engaged on the music of the "task of his life," to unfurl the banner of a rival *Nibelungen* at Weimar itself, indelibly to associate the name of that theatre with its first production! Supposing Dorn's *Nibelungen* to prove a success, might it not seriously interfere with Wagner's? Supposing it to prove a failure,* might its original production by Liszt (Jan. 22, '54—a fortnight after the Leipzig *Lohengrin* fiasco) not reflect on his advocacy of the other version also? Well-meant enough, it was deplorably bad policy, and the announcement must have been gall and wormwood to Wagner, though he takes no articulate notice either of it or of Liszt's later allusion (Feb. 21, '54): "Dorn has been here, and conducted the 2nd performance of his *Nibelungen*.

---

* Ere long it earned the witty nickname "*Nie-gelungen*" (never prospered); "this pun is none of my minting," writes Bülow to Liszt Jan. '57. For more about Dorn's vapid opera, see Appendix.

The work is to be given at Berlin in six weeks' time." Now, Liszt makes this statement directly after the remark, "There is some probability that Berlin may come along (*herankommt*) next autumn—when the time comes, I will let you know the little result of my endeavour; meanwhile *do not speak about it.*" This oracular utterance would leave us in doubt as to *which* "may come along"—whether the production of *Tannhäuser* or a mere concert—were it not that the collection of "Letters of Eminent Contemporaries" (*Briefe hervorragenden Zeitgenossen*) shews Liszt to have that morning received a letter from Dorn himself, a slice whereof I here append:—

H. DORN TO LISZT, Feb. 19, 1854.—"I have not thanked you earlier for your kindnesses to me at Weimar, your readiness to further all my plans, the practical proposals you made to me, your hospitality [and so on], because I wished at the same time to give you a definite answer about our contemplated Wagner-concert, and I could not do that before I knew for certain whether my "Nibelungen" would tread the Berlin boards this season (which I still doubted while at Weimar), or not until next autumn. It is now decided, that the first performance can and shall take place the end of March—and that decision carries with it the impossibility of my simultaneously engaging in an undertaking that would involve such extensive preparations as the concert aforesaid. In April, again, it would be too late; so nothing remains to me, save the wish to find you just as ready to enter into my plans at the beginning of October as you have shewn yourself in February; a point on which, although I have no doubt, I once more press you. In any case it will be an advantage to the three succeeding concerts intended by myself, if our introductory prelude conducted by Meister Liszt is not too widely parted from the postlude. I scarcely need tell you, of what great benefit the Weimar production has been to the remodelling and whole future of my opera—and this also, beyond the momentary success, I owe to you alone," etc., etc., including an acid little greeting to "the young men who have alighted in the shadow of Liszt's laurel-tree on the Ilm. May they all be as severe towards themselves as they are to others."

Anything more utterly selfish can hardly be conceived. All Liszt's benefactions, so obviously conferred with the ulterior aim of helping Richard Wagner, are to be turned to nothing but the glorification of the by-no-means-struggling junior Berlin Kapellmeister! Human, hideously human. A week at the outside would have sufficed for all the musical preparations of

that one-night Wagner programme, apart from Liszt's share in them, in a city where the artistic material was so easy to procure; so that there need be no fear of clashing with the preparations for Dorn's own opera. Another thing might clash, though, dear Herr Dorn—superior attraction: else *why* should "April be too late," seeing that the concert-season did not end till May? So the Berlin Wagner-concert is knocked on the head for sake of a competing *Nie-gelungen.*

Thus Bülow was right in his warning about Dorn at least, and in the *N. Z.* of July 7 we read: "A correspondent writes us from Berlin [not Bülow, then in Dresden], Negotiations about Richard Wagner's Tannhäuser are still in the air. The Intendance is said to be not indisposed to produce the famous work next winter; only our Kapellmeisters [Taubert and Dorn], as people say, will not consent to Liszt's condition that he shall conduct the four weeks of rehearsal in person. Though the Kapellmeisters may be right from a business standpoint in maintaining that a good deal of friction might arise from the entry of a third person into the operatic control, no common-sense person will blame either Liszt or Wagner for not wanting to risk the success of such a work on one of Germany's chief stages in the hands of men whereof the one is openly adverse to their tendency, the other belongs to the class of rivals." That takes us a few months forward, but will be useful in our estimate of the next stage of the Berlin complication.

Respecting these Berlin *Tannhäuser* negotiations much new material has quite recently come to light, and I must say at once that it gives a somewhat different complexion to the affair from that to be deduced from the Wagner-Liszt Correspondence alone. Admitted behind the scene, we find that none of the principal actors were wholly in the right, none wholly in the wrong—the usual experience when one gets to the bottom of things. Even Dorn has a scrap of a feather to wag in his cap; whilst Hülsen, however unsatisfactorily he may have behaved at the end of the first attempt (vol. iii), however rudely ten years later, produces a far more favourable impression in the negotiations that occupy the years 1854-5. Liszt, on the contrary, shews a certain unamenable obtuseness, and Wagner an explicable bashfulness about confessing to his friend and agent what he really wants. Of the minor characters, on the other hand, Wagner's brother

Albert comes out of the fracas very much the worse for wear; whereas Minna appears in an entirely new and hitherto-unsuspected rôle, most satisfactorily performed.*

Before tapping this new source, I must remind the reader that the negotiations of 1852 had ended in sand: Wagner had conceded point after point, until he heard from his niece in January '53 "that Tannhäuser was not to be thought of for the present, as the 'Feensee' and Flotow's 'Indra' were to be given first"; whereupon he had demanded and received back the score, and committed the entire matter to *Liszt's* hands for the future.† Then had come the court-authorities' frustration of a projected performance at Kroll's theatre in the summer of '53; rather a proof of Hülsen's anxiety to secure the work for the Royal stage. After that, we hear nothing until Jan. 15, '54, when Wagner's financial position has been much imperilled by the Leipzig fiasco of *Lohengrin*, and he writes Liszt: "Something *thorough* (Ordentliches) must be done on the road now-entered of the prostitution

---

* We owe this new material to the research of Dr Wilhelm Altmann, Principal Librarian to the Berlin Royal Library, among the archives of the Berlin Court-theatre, the results whereof he has published in three articles contributed to *Die Musik* of March-May 1903. A portion of the documents covers a period already treated in my previous volumes: not to dislocate the order of events, I shall deal with that portion in the Appendix, where will be found, among other things, translations of two important letters that passed between Wagner and Hülsen in October 1852. In Hülsen's letter occurs the remark, "It was Dorn himself who first aroused in me the idea of the possibility of a performance of 'Tannhäuser' on the Royal stage at Berlin"; nevertheless it is clear that Dorn's objection to being subordinated to Liszt constituted the ultimate main difficulty. As to Meyerbeer, though it is still open to surmise whether he had anything to do with the first rupture (1852-3) —regarding the course of which the 'acts' are silent—he plainly had no hand whatever in the second (1854).

† Dr Altmann tells us that the "Feensee" (*Lac des Fées*) was a mere case of revival and remounting, also that "Indra" was first performed at Berlin March 23, '53: after that date it would be most unusual for a new work to be produced before the next season.—The still more recent publication (*Bayr. Bl.* 1904) of Wagner's letters to Dorn's half-brother, Schindelmeisser, throws light on yet another point or two; e.g. Feb. 16, '53: "As regards my reclamation of the Tannhäuser score from *Berlin*, I should have to think *Dorn* fairly naïve if he made that also a reproach to me; for I am much afraid none knows better than he, that, even *without* that withdrawal of mine, my Tannhäuser would not have been given in Berlin." A subsequent letter of May or June '54, I must cite in its due chronological order.

of my art—else all is up with me. Have you not thought of Berlin again? Something **must** be brought off there now, if everything is not to come to a dead stop" (207 *ant.*). These words are important, as a very strong hint to Liszt—to whom he had referred Hülsen a year ago "for everything" (iii, 386)—that *Tannhäuser* must be granted to the Berlin opera-house without quixotic conditions. It would be suicidal, in fact, to act otherwise: now that this opera was already being given right and left, the example of Berlin could no longer operate as a standard of performance, whether good or bad; its "prostitution" for the sake of money would fall under a very different category from that of the almost virgin *Lohengrin;* yet that prostitution must be made sufficiently attractive, i.e. the work must be given with a certain verve, to ensure its really bringing money in.—Liszt, as we have seen, does not reply to this letter for over a month; but, as we shall presently learn, he "discussed the whole matter several times with Dorn" during the latter's visit to Weimar in February, though Dorn makes no explicit allusion to it in his letter which I have quoted apropos of the concert-scheme.

Now we enter the new phase, where the *W.-L. Corr.* is most interestingly supplemented by the archives of the Berlin opera-house.

April 4, '54, Liszt writes Wagner that at the Coburg-Gotha dinner-table, on the occasion of the première of the Duke's opera *Santa Chiara* (Apr. 2), he had met von Hülsen, who "led the conversation to the production of your works in Berlin, and told me he was waiting for your transference of the proprietorship to Bote und Bock.* I permitted myself to reply that I had very good cause to doubt that would ever happen—and even if B. and B. acquired the scores of 'Tannhäuser' and 'Lohengrin,' I could not for the moment assume that you would be inclined to depart from your previous condition of my summons to Berlin for sake of an adequate performance of your works. Write me how this matter stands. I don't want to advise you—yet I consider

* Bock seems to have also been in Gotha at the time (see Liszt to Carolyne, March 31), hoping to get the job of engraving Duke Ernst's opera. In his reply to Liszt of Apr. 9 Wagner declares that this is the first he had heard of the name of the would-be purchaser whom his business-agent had in view last winter, but that he now has no intention of *selling* his operas wholesale to anybody—very wisely too.

that the Berlin production remains (*bleibt*) a weighty point for you, and that you will gain nothing by altering the previous status of the question—namely, that your works should only be produced through my interposition and according to my judgment." A little weight should be attached to that "remains" (for which Dr Hueffer has substituted "is"), as it shews that Liszt detects a certain weakening on this point in Wagner's January letter. Further, it should be observed that Liszt has begun by placing himself in a somewhat hostile attitude towards the very man he wants to summon him, and at the same time has made it awkward to retreat from a condition as to which he is asking Wagner's latest instructions! That is not very expert diplomacy. It may sound impertinent to criticise the manner of so unselfish an act as Liszt's intervention in the Berlin contest; but we shall find in due course that he is rather nettled by the steps it eventually becomes necessary for Wagner to take, and it is well to ascertain how the various difficulties arose.

In the same breath Liszt reports (he does not say on whose authority) that another company proposes to take *Tannhäuser* to Berlin that summer, and he presumes that Wagner will not consent to such a thing. This elicits from the composer the remark: "I find it hard to comprehend how Herr von Hülsen can be so naïve as to think I would agree to a production of Tannhäuser in Berlin by the Königsberg company. I shall write to Königsberg this very day.* But I beg *you* to write Hülsen at once, and inform him of my *veto*." At the same time Liszt is to inform Hülsen that "I am firmly resolved to have no more personal dealings with Berlin, but solely through you and according to your judgment. Therefore if he ever proposed to give an opera of mine, and were merely waiting to have nothing to do with me (since he has fallen out with me personally), but with a *third* party (Bote und Bock, as he believed)—this would offer the best opportunity of arranging everything with him without personal contact with me, as he would have to do with *you* alone. As my attorney you therefore entered a protest against the intended performance by the Königsberg company; in the same capacity you would also be prepared to arrange the

* May 2: "The Königsberg theatre-director has answered me that he had no idea of presenting Tannhäuser in Berlin. Whatever nonsense can Herr H. have told you? Would you care to write him?"

other matter with him.—I fancy it would thus be a good occasion to bring the Berlin affair itself to a desirable issue.—'Tis a case of need, I assure you!—Heaven knows how I am to help myself now; and, though I don't want to plague you any more with that subject, I'm bound to tell you that your mediation might do me another great service in my present plight . . [re Munich, *vid. ant.*] . . None but a friend like yourself could one ask to do so much for others when he himself is in so horrible a fix as you, poor fellow, seem to be!"

The last clause, referring to the eternal obstacles to Liszt's union with his princess, will account for a good deal in his conduct of this affair—perhaps also for his treating that *Holländer* essay as a "relaxation" rather than a serious study: his mind was not free to take in all the bearings. Had it been, he would surely have guessed that Wagner's present dealings with one big court-theatre might be taken as guide for his own with the other ("I have posed no conditions to Dingelstedt, as I trust him"); he would also have seen that the suggested "protest" against a rival performance could but produce an excellent impression at Berlin, even were there no foundation for the rumour. Finally, he would have recognised the great urgency, for his friend's pocket, of coming to some reasonable compromise such as is quite plainly hinted here. But the poor man had told Wagner Apr. 4, "I am thoroughly fatigued and run down"; and the Munich business appears to have been all that he could muster energy to attend to at present. Perhaps, also, he was reluctant to throw himself at Hülsen's head without more definite cause. At anyrate he says no more about Berlin till the 20th of May, when the real battle begins with two letters he encloses to Wagner, namely a note from Hülsen and a copy of his own reply:—

HÜLSEN TO LISZT.*—Esteemed Herr Doktor!

In pursuance of our conversation when I had the honour of meeting you at Gotha, I ask you most respectfully:

If I wish to bring out Tannhäuser the beginning of next winter, what are the conditions?

---

* Given in No. 154 of the *W.-L. Corr.* I do not think it requisite to print Liszt's answer in full, as the reader can easily refer to it for himself, in the same collection.

Have the kindness, honoured Sir, to let me have an answer as speedily as possible.

With the highest esteem, Ew. Hwgb.'s

most faithfully

Berlin, 17. May 54. [signed] HÜLSEN.

However terse and business-like, there is no gainsaying that the above is a polite and well-intentioned missive.—Liszt makes the initial mistake of answering it at needless length, presumably under the dictation of many-worded Carolyne, and of turning Hülsen's inquiry about *Tannhäuser* into one concerning Wagner's operas in the plural. His language is also polite, of course, but already betrays a tendency to preach, and there is an air of domineering in the mode of posing his conditions: "Before one arrives at rehearsals at all, I consider it necessary that a categorical discussion without ceremony (*Weitläufigkeiten*) should take place between Your Excellency and myself, to settle A) the casting of the rôles, B) the distribution of rehearsals (at some of which I should necessarily have to be present)." For such a conference Liszt offers to come to Berlin at the end of the Weimar season, five weeks hence. About the composer's fee he will inquire, but is sure that Wagner will make no excessive demand; for his own part, though his co-operation will mean a month's stay in Berlin, "the success to be anticipated affords me a kind of satisfaction which I should not willingly alloy with an estimate of my *diet*-expenses (without following any *diet*)." What sprite can have prompted the pun, as much out of place here as in a sermon or lease? An incorrigible habit, as may be seen in Liszt's letters to all his disciples, but singularly irritant as preamble to the imperious next paragraph: "So far as I have learnt thereafter, Wagner [once] expressed the wish that his operas should be produced under my direction as an absolute condition for Berlin. Flattered as I can but feel by this reliance of Wagner's, yet (in power of my unlimited authorisation) I permit myself to leave the question of my conducting a *question réservée* for the present, as to which I reserve to myself a later decision according to events (*je nachdem*)." A wellnigh intolerable reservation in such a form, notwithstanding that Liszt proceeds to soften it with: "Let us hope that a means will be found of guarding my responsibility toward Wagner and his works without unduly obtruding myself on the Berlin personnel."

Sending these two documents to Wagner, Liszt observes, "I still am rather tired and unwell. Letter-writing and negotiating are insufferable to me." Remember that, when you find Wagner answering him May 26, "You have written *most admirably*." The letter to Hülsen having passed into the realm of accomplished facts, criticism of its phraseology would now have been a bootless task; what else could Wagner do, but thank his friend for all his kindly pains? Moreover, he is in the full glow of the last pages of his *Rheingold* score, so deep in it that he cannot tear himself away for more than a few minutes: no frame of mind for mincing sentences. Yet from these hurried lines themselves we may judge how he would have wished Hülsen to be answered, had he been consulted in the first place: "Since it cannot wait—merely this: *tantième*—and nothing further. If the tantième is to turn out well, i.e. if my operas are to be given *often*, the Intendant must have a sincere good-will and inclination for the thing. For that sake we will treat him handsomely."

"The Intendant must have"—*muss der Intendant haben*—can be read in two ways; yet it is manifest that Wagner meant, "must be *caused* to have," i.e. must be coaxed from a state of presumed indifference, won over to a friendly attitude, away from hostile influences. That this was the chief object in getting *Liszt* to saddle himself with the Berlin load, is clear from a letter Wagner writes to Schindelmeisser about this date; Schindelmeisser, the friend of his boyhood, whom he had told a month before (Apr. 26), "I can only regret that *you* belong to no more important place (as regards the audience) than splendid but deserted Darmstadt. Would you were at *Berlin* or *Vienna!*"—a real friend on the spot was what he needed. The said letter to Schindelmeisser unfortunately is undated, though its opening sentence, referring to an invitation conveyed in that of April 26, shews that it cannot well have been written more than about a month later; hence it would seem to fall within the last few days of May '54, just after the hurried lines to Liszt:—

WAGNER TO SCHINDELMEISSER.—Dearest Friend!

So I'm not to see you, it appears, this summer either. This time I had already planted it firm in my head: how I should have liked to be able to speak with you once more! I'm sure we should have had plenty to entertain each other with. Moreover, I should have found the opportunity of telling you something which I

feel compelled at least to hint (*andeuten*) to you by letter. Once before, you made a remark to me about *Berlin* that leads me to think it good to tell you how that matter really stands. I have left the question whether, how, and when Tannhäuser is to be given at Berlin, solely to *Liszt's* decision, and for the following true reasons. In *Dorn*, who previously proposed this opera to the Berlin Intendant, I have no mistrust, though he once horrified me by a mode of dealing which was bound to annul all character of friendship between us [i, 257-9]. But whether Dorn is the man, by his nature and position, to bring my Tannhäuser to such a footing at Berlin as I must expect if I'm also to count on receipts from it, I can but doubt. I know Berlin, and know that everything—up to a certain point—is *made* there: now, it is not in the least my wish to get my *reputation made* in Berlin, but I must and mean to draw from my opera the material profit which the Berlin tantième offers me in favourable circumstances. I'm candid enough to confess this undisguisedly: my general indifference to Fame etc. is just as great as my disinclination to owe to any manner of imprudence a serious diminution of my takings. And then, your brother (if he really has troubled about it) has not as yet succeeded in enlightening Herr von Hülsen about my works to the extent of inspiring him with any other opinion of them, than that "he must give them in the long run, even though he expect nothing further therefrom." My own aim, on the other hand, is not to give the opera till people are quite seriously determined, from top to bottom, to make sure of such a substantial success as one has a right to expect from its antecedents. Anyone may easily perceive that herein I am not remonstrating against the purely musical conducting (*Direction*) of the Berlin Kapellmeisters; on the contrary, I am remonstrating against the lukewarmness and inner indifference which I chiefly espy in the Intendant. I know very well what extremely dangerous and powerful foes Berlin contains for me: to the *Meyerbeerian* influence, which most astutely stopped my coming to the front in Berlin before, I have no wish to expose my Tannhäuser also as prey. Liszt himself and his position toward Berlin—as things now stand—are so admirably adapted to counteract that influence with the greatest skill, that I should indeed be a fool if—after the experiences suffered—I were to disregard his wish to represent me there. Only Liszt, and providing he receives an official commission, can successfully attune the Intendance itself to all the necessaries the thing requires if it is not to pass away as quickly as it came. Whether he ultimately conducts the first representation in person, he himself wishes to be left in abeyance at present, though—to speak plainly—I should like him to reap that outward satisfaction for the share he in a sense has won in the existence of my Tannhäuser, which without him and his tireless zeal for me would most likely have remained altogether unknown. Eh, it would rejoice me to see him

rewarded through the Berlin production with the acme of success: and as I know that it would give him joy too, I hardly have a care for aught besides.

Precisely to yourself, who next to Liszt have bestirred yourself with such devoted friendship for my works, I have been longing to make this communication: conclude thence my regard and estimation for you. For the rest, if you would like to convey something of this to Dorn, I should only be too happy; it is to be hoped he, also, will then see that mistrust and prejudice against himself are not the reason for my requirements of the Berlin Intendance; requirements, moreover, which I must perhaps expect never to be fulfilled.—

Farewell, then, dear friend! Let me hear from you soon, and be thanked for all the goodness you have shewn me.

Your R. W.

From that "perhaps" toward the end of this letter it is pretty clear that it was written before Liszt's next communication, so that we may safely assign it to the verge of May-June '54. Thus it forms a commentary on the letter to Liszt of May 26 (*vid. sup.*), and we learn that Wagner is fully alive to the dash of innocent ambition in Liszt's desire; on the other hand, that he counts as much on Liszt's relations with the court of Berlin—through the Prince of Prussia's Weimar spouse—also on Liszt's former intimacy with Meyerbeer, as on his artistic influence. Between so many fires, it is extraordinary how delicately Wagner handles whatever of the tactics he can still control, and how loyally he backs up his friend in those he can control no longer. Has Liszt handled his negotiations, the vital part of the strategy, with equal tact? For my own part, I am scarcely surprised at finding the Berlin Intendant reply to him as follows:—

HÜLSEN TO LISZT.*—Esteemed Herr Doktor.

To your favour of the 20th inst. I have the honour to reply: Under *conditions* I merely subsumed the *pecuniary*, as I cannot submit myself to other ones. The Royal stage in Berlin has mounted all the masterpieces of Gluck and Mozart, moreover Spontini's and Meyerbeer's operas, and will also be in a position, I think, to master Richard Wagner's "Tannhäuser" and bestow on it the care and

* Translated from Dr Altmann's reproduction in *Die Musik*. This letter is not published with the *W.-L. Corr.*; in no. 156, enclosing a draft of his answer, Liszt says: "Return me Hülsen's letter, as I have not taken a copy of it, and I don't want it to fall into other hands."

attention [requisite] to present it to the public worthily in every regard.

I therefore cannot enter into conditions respecting either the distribution of rehearsals or the casting of rôles ; that must be left entirely to my discretion, albeit it goes without saying that your wish, honoured Sir, shall be taken into account as much as possible and with alacrity.

Just as little can any other than one of the Royal Kapellmeisters [be allowed to] conduct. Only in favour of the composers, have exceptions occurred, with special sanction from His Majesty the King. At our very first handling of the opera it was committed to Kapellmeister Dorn, and he will certainly do everything demanded of him by his duty and the interest in the work repeatedly displayed.

If Your Honour will do for it *privatim* whatever personal discussion with the Kapellmeister and executants can effectuate, not only shall we acknowledge that with thanks, but you will certainly be also met with appreciative friendliness. Accordingly I can engage myself to nothing else than to accept the opera as every other for presentation on the Royal stage, and to pay honorarium or tantième after the first performance ; I should prefer the latter.

Self-evidently, I shall accept the work only to bring it out as worthily and artistically as possible ; yet I am thoroughly indisposed to enter any obligation whereby alike the dignity and capability of the institution and my own authority would be too closely touched. I ask for the composer's confidence in myself and the Royal stage, which is the more necessary as major and minor theatres have already given this work without conditions.

Berlin, 29. May 1854. With the most complete respect
[signed] HÜLSEN.

Surely here was a golden bridge for Liszt's retreat from impossible conditions, conditions higher-pitched than that which Wagner himself had tacitly waived two years ago. If the Herr Intendant could not see his way to a temporary abdication in favour of the Hochgeehrter Herr Doktor, why not "treat him handsomely," as Wagner had suggested? Why not accept the office of private adviser? Everything was to be gained thereby, and more especially the probability that things would not go to rack and ruin, out of spite, the moment Liszt's back was turned. Of course, if he did not care to play second fiddle when bestowing his services gratis, nobody could compel him to; but the situation bears a strong resemblance to the famous problem of an irresistible force confronted with an indomitable obstacle, and Liszt plays the part of the obstacle. Instead of waiting to consult

his friend anent the Intendant's proposed way-out, he forthwith sends the latter what I can only characterise as a 'lawyer's-letter'; he stiffens his back to the wrong people; the course on which he might have insisted with some effect at Leipzig, when dealing with a mere speculative lessee, he makes an ultimatum to an imperturbable court-officer: * "diplomacy" cast to the winds.

Liszt's answer of June 3 to Hülsen begins with an unwarranted taunt: "from your favour of May 29 I can but see that Your Honour is indisposed to take account of the artistic views of Wagner which explain and prompt my intervention in the matter of the production of his works in Berlin." On the contrary, by his invitation to Liszt to come and work privately, Hülsen had shewn himself disposed to take much account of those artistic views.—Then Liszt proceeds to *argue*, in the same polemical tone as that of his preface to Pohl's brochure (166 *ant.*), on Hülsen's innocent remark about the works of Gluck etc. Now, if no one likes being treated to a controversial missive, still less does one like his words distorted: Hülsen had said, "Ich kann somit nichts anderes eingehen, als die Oper wie jede andere zur Darstellung auf der königlichen Bühne anzunehmen"; to *that* Liszt replies, "wenn wirklich die Intendanz 'bloss gesonnen ist, den Tannhäuser oder Lohengrin nur so wie jedes andre Werk zu geben,'" † quite ignoring the distinction between the conditions on which a work is accepted and the manner in which it is to be produced.—Next comes a statement of twofold interest: "A few months ago I discussed the whole state of affairs several times with Kapellmeister Dorn, and am convinced that he will not describe the stipulation made by Wagner [?], of my unambiguous participation in the production of his works at Berlin, as an unreasonable demand"—an argument that cuts both ways, since, with a Dorn so sweetly pliant, Liszt could have no fear that his unofficial aid would bear no fruit. Worse follows with a lavish use of textual quotations from Hülsen treated disputatiously (a

* His chosen biographer relates how he had once refused to play before the girl Queen Isabella of Spain unless all rules of etiquette of the most punctilious Court on earth were broken for his formal presentation there.

† The *W.-L. Corr.*, which has simply Liszt's draft to go upon, encloses merely "wie jedes andere Werk" within inverted commas; but that makes little difference. The general deduction is not, of course, that he is an intentional sophist, but a most careless reader: quite as dangerous a fault.

terrible offence in private correspondence), the introduction of a proverb about the "fifth whist-player, whose place is 'under the table'"—savouring of the pun in the previous letter—and the final declaration: "Consequently I am obliged to beg Your Excellency either to ratify the proposals of my previous letter, and as Intendant of the Royal stage to legitimise my participation in the rehearsals and production of Wagner's works [still plural] in Berlin according to the wish so plainly expressed by him—or else to let the whole matter remain in its present negative *statu quo*." *

Truly, a pistol presented at Hülsen's head! The only wonder is, that he did not drop the thing at once, instead of making one further attempt to get Liszt to descend from his stilts. Before reaching that, however, we must inquire what Wagner thought of his plenipotentiary's last move. Liszt asks him, in his covering letter of June 3, "I hope you will approve of my answer"; to which Wagner replies by return of post, June 7: "Again but a couple of lines in haste, dear Franz. You can scarcely have a moment's doubt that I heartily thank you for the energy with which you are behaving toward Hülsen in my interest? Only save the soul, and even the body will also fare best! I return you Hülsen's letter!—It pains me, however, that I am giving you this trouble!—But don't let us expect anything: I am of opinion that you should not answer him any more at all!" The last two sentences are the ones that count, and perhaps it is a pity that the rest are not more explicit: the allusion to "soul and body," for instance, may be read as 'spirit and letter.' Yet, what else was Wagner to say, now that things had already been brought to such a pass in contravention of his broad hint to treat Hülsen handsomely? He could not tell so generous a volunteer what he might justly have told a mere business-agent: A pretty mess you've made of it!

Now comes another cook to spoil the broth. Dear brother

* A postscript adds: "In his last letter Wagner writes me that he leaves the determination of the pecuniary conditions at Berlin entirely to me [?], and is satisfied with tantième"; but it sets no store on Wagner's admonition to inspire the Intendant with "good-will and inclination for the thing." In the German edition of the Wagner-Liszt letters, and consequently in their English translation, the word "Tantième" has unfortunately been misread as "Tannhäuser."

Albert holds some sort of position at the Berlin court-theatre,* and is treated by Hülsen as a confidant, in this quasi-family affair at least. Neither he nor his daughter can claim the credit of prompting the Berlin pourparlers of 1854, however, for he writes Hülsen June 4 from Königsberg, whither he has accompanied Johanna on her starring-tour (commenced about a week before Hülsen's first letter to Liszt) :—

ALBERT WAGNER TO HÜLSEN.—Naturally it has much delighted us, that you have suddenly determined to give 'Tannhäuser,' as we are convinced that we shall have a handsome representation in Berlin.† . . .

My heartiest thanks for forwarding your correspondence with Liszt [not including the last letter, of course], and if I have not answered you at once, the reason is that I instantly wrote Liszt myself, and urged him not to obstruct by fresh buffooneries (*Quakeleien*) an undertaking that interests us both. I have made things a wee bit warm for him, . . . tried to remove every doubt of an unworthy production at Berlin, told him of the elegance with which everything is mounted under your régime ; but also set you up as a bit of a Wow-wow, and led him to fear that you're just the sort of man to shove the opera back at the last moment if he placed too many difficulties in your way. I believe I have done quite right. To Liszt and my brother the Berlin production is of very great moment, and I fancy they'll listen to reason.

Your answer to Liszt [May 29] has my and Johanna's completest approbation. These composers and enthusiasts are enough to send one mad . . . With my brother himself I deal little and unwillingly. I favour his great talent, which I value as highly as anybody ; with his character, however, I will not have much to do. . . .

Very pretty ! Characters are cheap, when one brother can sell another's for a mess of pottage. The Appendix will shew at what figure Herr Albert's had been rated in more than one English Law-court not so long before.

---

* Exactly what, at this date, does not appear. Not till the end of 1857 does Albert Wagner become official Regisseur, i.e. Stage-manager in chief.

† The dots correspond with those in the reproduction by Dr Altmann, who tells us that the letter is a very circumstantial one, dealing also with the cast : "Albert Wagner considers that the work can be given better now than in 1852. He also tries to influence Hülsen to give 'Tannhäuser' with the original ending, as he [or Johanna ?] cannot take kindly to the re-appearance of Elisabeth as a corpse." A man's enemies are the men of his own house indeed.

Liszt had delivered his ultimatum before receiving the choice effusion from Albert just referred-to, so that the latter had no influence whatever on it; but it has some influence on Albert's brother—it disgusts him with the whole affair.' June 8, while Wagner's answer of the 7th is still on the road, Liszt writes again: "Herewith, dearest Richard, I forward you your brother's *twaddle*,* together with the rough draft of my simple reply. Presumably the whole coach will remain stuck for another while, after which negotiations will commence anew.—I am a good hand at understanding people [?], even when the real drift of their phrases is not and cannot be expressed.—I have had to experience too much of that sort of thing, for it to deceive me.—The difficulty lies neither with Hülsen nor with other people named, but—with *those* whom we, too, will not name, though we know them a little." Whoever may be meant by "those," Liszt is plainly on the wrong tack here: apart from Dorn (in all probability one of the "other people named"), the difficulty has been created by his own obstinacy. If he suspected Meyerbeer, as one would naturally conclude, nothing could be more erroneous in this instance: Meyerbeer's return to Berlin, "after a very long absence in Paris," can be fixed by records of Paris and Berlin reporters (*Mus. World* June 17 and 24, '54) at the exact middle of June, i.e. a week later than this letter of Liszt's itself.

But Wagner also had just been treated to some of his brother's "twaddle," as we shall learn in a moment, and was heartily sick of the whole thing. "Dear Franz," he replies in that undated letter which ends "in the sign of the eagle" (233 *ant.*), "Here you have the *twaddle* back again, as I by no means begrudge you its ownership. Let us leave all this odious nonsense on one side: when one hears this jargon [in favour] of want of character and honour, which these most stupid souls call 'wisdom,' 'tis as if one had dropped among a hundred-thousand idiots. It is our sole *good fortune*, at bottom, that we never accommodate ourselves to this sort of people: gain enough, if we only abide by that. To

* "Den X'schen *Bafel*." It is to be hoped that in some future edition of the *W.-L. Corr.* the numerous "X"s and initials will be replaced by the proper names of the original, now that their bearers have passed beyond the sphere of wounded feelings. In the present instance, as in Wagner's answer, I take on myself to supply the obvious key.

'get' something by it, of course we can't expect.—So at this instant I also am completely satisfied with our *not* doing what Albert wants: that, quite by itself, puts me in excellent humour; what else betides, we may treat with indifference. At Berlin we celebrate—*we*—entirely for ourselves—a feast of friendship; or what in 'Berlin' besides? What else is 'Berlin' to us?—A thousand thanks for all, both what and how, that you are doing!" —In other words: Berlin may go hang, "at this instant"; if it is to be a choice between Liszt's and Albert's way of bargaining, a thousand times rather Liszt's, though it ruthlessly destroys all prospect of those sorely-needed tantièmes. So brother Albert's vulgarities have defeated their own end.

Almost on the same day that Richard is writing the above to Liszt, Albert writes again to Hülsen (June 11):—

ALBERT W. TO HÜLSEN.—Liszt's letter to me of to-day decidedly expresses the wish, between the lines, that I should again play the mediator with you and incline you to his wishes.* . . .

Starting from this point of view (since this opera will do us credit), I would heartily pray you now, perhaps to yield to that party's whims to some extent. For, if Liszt's statement in his letter to yourself is true—that he has already come to an agreement with Kapellmeister Dorn—when one comes to look at the thing it really is all one to you, nay, desirable, if Liszt, who is so familiar with the opera, assists Dorn with advice at rehearsals. If Kapellmeister Dorn doesn't mind, it really can't hurt you. It will improve the thing in any case, and perhaps prevent the little operations of composer-jealousy. If only Liszt does not conduct in public, when all is said, that is enough for the honour of the establishment; of the advantage he would bring, one might certainly profit. . . .

Somehow there is a peculiarly repellent flavour in every line inscribed by this elder brother, and we can appreciate the effect he must have produced at this juncture both on Liszt and our hero. "If Liszt's statement is true," possibly a mere figure of speech, is a particularly ugly one, though it points to a natural surprise that Dorn should have hitherto said nothing of any such agreement (vague promises at Weimar, perhaps, conveniently to

* From the tone of Liszt's allusion to his "simple reply" we may be certain that he implied nothing of the kind. It is amusing, however, to note how each of the 'seconds' prides himself on his faculty of "reading between the lines."

be ignored when he returned to Berlin). Even where Albert Wagner has reason on his side, he overrates his own sagacity in making what he deems a brilliantly novel suggestion: Hülsen's letter of May 29, to a copy whereof we have already heard Albert refer, had offered Liszt that golden bridge before the latter launched his ultimatum of June 3.

Ere Hülsen replies to that ultimatum, he sends Albert Wagner a concept of his answer. The concept is not preserved; yet we can easily imagine that it might betray a certain justifiable ire. Albert suggests some alteration, and with the substance of his advice we are bound to agree; but its form is as odious as ever:—

ALBERT W. TO HÜLSEN, June 15.—Would you not perhaps adopt a *milder* tone to Liszt, that would still leave him an opening for *yielding?* I will write Liszt tomorrow again, or get my daughter to, and try to preach reason to him, at the same time putting him in a blue funk (*die Hölle heiss machen*). Perhaps he will write you then, acceding to your wish. Perhaps. If he doesn't, well, the madmen will have themselves to thank if they have to stay without the prestige (*Glanz*) and tantième of the Berlin Opera-house, and nobody can throw the blame on you; since no one either will or can condemn your view.

Both my daughter and myself most thoroughly agree with your letter to Liszt, as an ultimatum. There is no putting up with these people. . . .

To my brother I shall write no more [thus H. seems to have suggested it]; we have just had a brief, but very disagreeable correspondence, and, though I don't mind dealing with his works, I will have nothing to do with his person. . . .

What stands in place of those dots, only Dr Altmann can tell us, and he elects not to. Should it be unflattering to Richard Wagner, as we may guess, the vituperation could only recoil on the head of the writer: from first to last this precious Albert has shewn himself a *mauvaise langue* and marplot. In '52 A. did his best to undermine his brother's trust in Hülsen; had it not been for the tittle-tattling of himself and daughter, quite possibly the score might never have been withdrawn by Richard. In '53 we have seen Liszt obliged to read Johanna—whom we cannot dissociate from her father—a lesson on the gratitude she owed her uncle. And now Albert's low cunning, which he mistakes for arch diplomacy, inspires suspicion all around, setting or keeping

everyone at loggerheads in his futile attempts to effect a reconcilement through puerile intimidation. One's chief surprise would be that an official of Hülsen's birth and standing should have admitted such a rank outsider to his counsels, were it not for two considerations: first, the man was father of his prima donna; second, he was brother of the composer whose opera the Intendant was really anxious to secure—and Hülsen did *not* consult him till he found Liszt such an awkward customer to tackle alone. Luckily for ourselves, I believe there will be no further occasion to meet this undesirable acquaintance (except in the Appendix). We may wash our hands of the low-comedy brother, and return to people of at least some decency of mouth.

Immediately after receipt of Albert Wagner's letter, von Hülsen writes Liszt, June 17:—

HÜLSEN TO LISZT.—Dear Sir!

I am too sincerely imbued with the wish to incorporate "Tannhäuser" in the repertory of the Royal stage, not to make one more effort to induce you to waive a condition to which I cannot consent, in fact, without trenching too closely on the dignity of the institute and the [functions of the] Royal Kapellmeisters.

You say it is beyond question that I possess the confidence of the composer; but indeed it is otherwise.*

Do come and work *privatim;* you will be met in a friendly spirit. But officially—it cannot be.

I should truly regret if my proposal shipwrecked, but also know the duties of my post.

Please answer soon, and rest assured of my most distinguished esteem.

Very sincerely

HÜLSEN.

---

* As Wagner has not exchanged a line with Hülsen since the autumn of 1852, this can but be another piece of Albert's mischief-making. If Albert wrote to his brother even in the same manner as to Liszt, on his own confession, describing Hülsen as a Wow-wow (*Wauwau*) who was "just the sort of man to shove the opera back (*zurückzuschieben*) at the last moment," it is extremely likely that Richard's incensed reply would not display an overwhelming "confidence" in the good-will of the Intendant. But we happen to know at least a morsel of A.'s communication to his brother, since R. Wagner writes Liszt in Letter 165 (undated and misplaced, but demonstrably of early October), "Hülsen told Albert that he considered the whole affair with me *trumped up*. Luckily I could console A. with the thought that *he* had not trumped it—but Hülsen is right: the thing is 'trumped up.' What

Another olive-branch quite amiably held out to Liszt. Why did he not reply at once with an offer to come and talk the matter over? The 24th of this month was the date after which, as he had originally informed Hülsen, he would be free to make a journey for that purpose; it would exactly fit in now. But no: acting on the letter, not the spirit of Wagner's admonition of June 7, he doggedly leaves this last appeal of Hülsen's unanswered by a line! Nor does he even report its receipt to Wagner.*

A fresh actor now moves across our stage, with a very tiny "one-line" part, yet gracefully played. What office Hofrath Teichmann may have held, I do not know, but the extract cited by Dr Altmann from his letter of July 3 to Liszt is of great importance through its independent testimony to the contrast between the latter's methods and those of his comrade:—

TEICHMANN TO LISZT, July 3.—When the composer of "Tannhäuser" was here in the year 1847, to bring out his "Rienzi," I had the pleasure of making his close acquaintance. I soon came to an understanding with him; he frankly bestowed his trust on me, which I certainly knew how to value. Then also there were things to *harmonise!* That I gladly undertook.—In life are we not all more or less referred thereto—and is there not a mediating poetry (*eine vermittelnde Poesie*)? As such you appear to me yourself in regard of Wagner's works. How much Wagner owes you already in this sense! The best acknowledge this unanimously, and above all, I am sure, does Wagner himself. It has been famed of Goethe that he was a communicable nature; what else does that mean, than to take a pleasure in regaling others with the good and beautiful, wherever found?

---

could throw more light on the genuineness of my successes, than the fact that even a loan of 1000 thalers could not be scraped together among all my 'admirers'?" For the "X"s I again have substituted "Albert" and "A.," without any fear of error. Dr Hueffer, not in possession of the key, has quite missed the point here, translating "*gemacht*" as "done for," instead of "trumped up"—the "thing" being Wagner's fame. There is no necessity to believe that *Hülsen* said anything of the sort, unless it were in a momentary fit of anger; but kind brother Albert wrote it, and evidently in course of that "brief and very disagreeable correspondence" of this month of June.

* Unless—a very bare unless—a letter of about this date be missing from the *W.-L. Corr.* Letter 160, Wagner's, is printed out of its proper order, however, and therefore will not help us here; the true next letter after 159 (the answer to Liszt's of June 8) is 161, of July 3, which does not so much as allude to Berlin.

Though the language of the latter half is a shade obscure, the compliment implied was irresistible, and Liszt could not help answering with a courtly bow; but he remained entrenched behind his proud *non possumus*:—

LISZT TO TEICHMANN.*—Much-honoured Sir!

Thanking you most kindly for your friendly lines, I allow myself in the first place to burden you with my best apologies to the Herr Intendant, Freiherr von Hülsen. In the matter of the production of Wagner's works in Berlin I really have nothing else to say, than what I have already written in my two letters to Herr von Hülsen last month,† since for my part I can choose no other standpoint than the purely artistic and friendly toward Wagner and his works. Moreover the circumstance has now to be added, that his Royal Highness the Grand Duke of Weymar during his recent visit to Berlin had a conversation with his Majesty the King of Prussia on the selfsame subject; and from what thereof has come to my knowledge, I have to hold myself entirely passive and at pause pending supreme commands.

Begging you to communicate this to Herr von Hülsen, I remain with distinguished esteem Your Honour's

most amicably

Weymar, 6th July 1854. F. LISZT.

Worse and worse; not the letter, but its news. What good could Liszt expect from this last move? Supposing the King of Prussia had consented to summon him in the terms of Liszt's two letters to Hülsen, it would be tantamount to making him temporary dictator of the Berlin Opera-house. Then, if Hülsen were a man of spirit, he would immediately resign his post, after such a snub; if he were not, he would allow things to take their course during Liszt's regency, no matter what the friction with other stage-officials, and promptly withdraw the opera so soon as Liszt laid down the sceptre. For it was not an ordinary case of insisting on a stipulation: the stipulator insisted on *himself*. It

---

* Given in the *Bayr. Bl.* of 1900, where the addressee is presumed to be "someone officially connected with the Berlin Opera-house," with a suggestion that that someone was Albert Wagner; but the counterpart above clears up the point, especially as Altmann tells us that Teichmann "had a high esteem for Liszt."

† Meaning the letters of May 20 and June 3, as the "apologies" are naturally for his non-reply to Hülsen's last.

was out of the question, and the more Liszt insisted, the less he made it possible to work with him; the remoter became all chance of friendly co-operation, even were he eventually to withdraw his rigid claim. We may imagine how he would have treated such a demand himself, let us say if Meyerbeer had made it a conditio sine quâ non of a possible performance of *L'Étoile du Nord* at Weimar that a given prima donna should have "official" liberty to regulate the rest of the cast, and the King of Prussia induced the Grand Duke to summon her on such an understanding after Liszt had repeatedly objected to it as an affront to the institute! He would at once have resigned his post of Court-conductor in Extraordinary; of that there can be no doubt.

Princess Wittgenstein was of a different opinion. Writing to thank Wagner for an autograph begged for a young-lady friend, she says:* "Leave Liszt to deal with Hülsen. Leave Berlin to him—entirely, completely.—It may go slowly, but it will go *well*, and above all, *decorously!* How good, how wise, how gentle and patient *he* is, I know!—Any other man would have sunk and drowned quite eighteen times, these last six years, in the storms that play about our little skiff. He keeps us still on the surface. . . . Liszt is indefatigable—he is altogether devoted to you—you know it.—Courage and hope!" From this it is manifest that Liszt was encouraged in his "patience" by his companion; it is also presumable that she helped, as her wont was, to draft those missives that led to the impasse. In itself her letter would be of no moment to us, beyond its evidence of a kind heart; ranged in its proper order, however, it accounts for Wagner's words to Liszt in Letter 162 (also undated, but of mid-July): "As regards the Berlin affair, rest assured that I'm glad to know it in *your hands* alone. I should be a fine fool if I wanted to take it out of them, so long as you're not tired of it. X [Albert or Hülsen?] will take good care not to apply to me!—All that is chatter."

* Wagner's "kind letter" to herself does not appear. The Princess's, undated, is ranged as No. 163 in the *W.-L. Corr.;* but, judging by internal evidence of various kinds, I should place it after No. 159. At anyrate it must have been despatched before Liszt received Wagner's intimation of July 3 (No. 161), "The Walküre is begun," as Carolyne asks, "For what are you waiting, to begin the Walküre?" In all probability, therefore, she is writing much about the same date as L. to Teichmann.

The letter to which Wagner is replying—"your beautiful cheerful letter from the Rhine"*—has not come down to us; so that we are still deprived of one small link in the meshwork; but it is clear that Wagner does not know how *friendly* the latest advances from Berlin had been. And how could he take the matter out of Liszt's hands, without robbing himself of the guarantee to be afforded by Liszt's presence in Berlin? If Liszt persistently declined to go in any other than an "official" capacity, Wagner could scarcely ask his friend and representative to eat his words.

Meanwhile, July 10, Hülsen has answered Liszt's message of the 6th (that conveyed through Teichmann), declaring that "under prevailing circumstances it certainly appeared best to him, also, to let the whole thing drop."† He continues: "A further exposition of divergent views can lead to nothing, as I shall never come to the conclusion to have 'Tannhäuser' rehearsed under your trusteeship (*Vormundschaft*).—That, after two fruitless attempts to bring this work upon the Royal stage, the management can undertake no third so long as I have the honour to stand at the head of it, is self-understood. I am sorry for this!" A little temper here, only natural after the contents of Liszt's last message.

As for Liszt, he writes Wagner on the 28th: "On my return here I find a definitively negative note from Hülsen regarding the production of Tannhäuser in Berlin, with the following peroration . . [quotes the last two sentences only] . . From another source, however, I learn that the thing is not to remain in this negative phase, and that the very highest quarters are not indisposed to call me to Berlin. We shall see.—Meantime I have answered Hülsen merely with a couple of lines." He does not send his friend a copy of those lines, but we now are placed in possession of them:—

---

* Liszt had left Weimar July 8 for the Rotterdam music-festival. On the 9th he writes Carolyne: "En vue de Mayence.—Le bateau néerlandais se met en marche. . . . Je veux faire mettre ces lignes à la poste de Cologne." His missing letter to Wagner would pretty certainly be written in course of the same day on the steamboat, away from all his documents; probably little more than a traveller's expatiations on the Rhineland scenery.

† Dr Altmann does not reproduce the opening of the letter, save in oblique narration as above.

LISZT TO HÜLSEN.—Your Excellency!

On my return from the Rotterdam music-festival, yesterday, I found your honoured note of July 10, and sincerely regret not to see my good will in the matter of Wagner's operas better recognised and more correctly grasped, than that note itself attests.

Your Excellency, as head of the Royal theatre in Berlin, has the right to order it entirely according to your judgment. On my side, without wishing to take any exception to the *fait non accompli*, I merely allow myself most modestly and positively to protest against the word and sense of a "*Vormundschaft*," which you ascribe to me, as my participation in the thing could in nowise give colour to (*motivieren*) a like idea,—and remain with the most distinguished regard Your Excellency's

most faithfully

F. LISZT.

Weimar, 28. July 1854.

Though the tone of this final letter of Liszt's is dignified and correct, he is wrong again on a question of fact: he *had* claimed "trusteeship" of the most explicit kind, and had demanded that it should be "legitimised" when invited to come and work "privatim." On his part it had been one continual stickling for official recognition. Nor is this a solitary instance of his inability to recognise the plain meaning of words, coupled with an almost morbid self-esteem. Little more than a year previously (March 22, '53) he had written Heinrich Brockhaus, objecting to "three errors of fact in the article concerning me [*Conversations-Lexikon*] . . . 3° my diploma of the University of Königsberg, which my biographer arbitrarily changes into a diploma of *Doctor of Music*, which was not the one delivered to me. . . . When you come to see me at Weymar, I shall be able to shew you amongst other diplomas that of the University of Königsberg, in virtue of which I have the exceptional honour of belonging to the class of Doctors in *Philosophy*, an honour for which I have always been particularly grateful to that illustrious University." A correction of this categoric kind is a serious enough affair to necessitate the looking up of documents: had Liszt *carefully* done so, he would have found that the Königsberg diploma, bestowed in 1842, began indeed with "*Ab ordine philosophorum*," but testified him "*Artis musicæ doctorem honoris causa creatum esse*," *

* The diploma is reproduced at length in L. Ramann's *Franz Liszt*, II. 182, also the official address in which Liszt is presented with "the diploma of a

i.e. the Faculty of Philosophy has created him Doctor of Music. Presumably neither he nor the Princess was much of a Latin scholar; but they might have taken expert advice before committing such an egregious mistake.

Truth to tell, it was bad for Liszt to have been so long the cynosure of every eye, and now to be the "Padisha" among a flock of young disciples obedient to his every nod. It made him resentful of any obstacle to the assertion of his will; and personal resentment was a thing of far longer duration with him than with Wagner, in whose case it almost invariably took the form of an explosion followed by a reconciliation. Hence so many of Liszt's plans frustrated; hence in part, perhaps, his eventual rupture with the Weimar theatre. His "Liebenswürdigkeit," or "amiability of manner," is proverbial; but beneath the velvet glove there lay a hand of steel, that often gripped too hard. Thus he was by no means an ideal negotiator, and, apart from his own great services to Wagner's cause at Weimar, he was able directly to effect very little for him outside, despite his strenuous unselfish efforts.

I am aware that with the above I have widely departed from the traditional view: I have done so with regret. But Wagner has often been reproached with "throwing Liszt over" in this Berlin transaction—Liszt half-mutters such a reproach himself, as we shall see—and it was right that we should look at the other side in all its bearings. To Wagner it was a most vital need, that a Berlin production of *Tannhäuser* should quickly mint him money; he impressed this more than once on Liszt: yet the latter declined to budge one inch from a personal stipulation that was shipwrecking the whole affair; he forgot his friend's necessities in pursuance of a wordy war.* That his conscience grew a

---

Doctor of Music," and his letter of thanks to the Königsberg Faculty of Philosophy (March 18, '42) for the "ehrenvollen Namen eines *Lehrer* der Musik."—Brockhaus' next edition of the *Lexikon* neatly replaced the "doctor" &c. with "various distinctions."

* Some small pecuniary assistance, on the other hand, he appears to have generously furnished from his own pocket toward the end of June; for Wagner begins his brief letter of July 3 with "A thousand thanks, dearest Franz; you have helped me out of an extreme predicament, after I had exhausted all other expedients. By autumn—I fancy—things will get into a little better trim with me." That his need was still pressing, however, is shewn above.

little uneasy hereon, is evinced by a remark of his to Bülow, to whom he writes Sept. 30: "In your last letter there is an error of fact, or rather of figures, which I wish to point out, though there is no utility in doing so. You tell me that it would need the representation of 'Tannhäuser' at Berlin to restore Wagner's finances. Alas! it would at the most be *une poire pour la soif*, nothing more; for, according to what Wagner writes me, he would need 10,000 francs at once—and in the best event it would take 'Tannhäuser' several months to produce the half of that sum (at the most) in tantièmes for Wagner. As I have been very directly mixed in the Berlin negotiations, I can assure you that Wagner's interests are not compromised there, and that I still consider his chances as good as possible. For the rest, he is at perfect liberty to get Tannhäuser presented whenever he thinks fit; and it certainly is not I, that will ever make him a shadow of reproach about it."—Now, as we shall very soon learn, the definite conclusion of negotiations with Berlin would have provided Wagner a full fifth of £400 at once, on account, whilst the actual performances brought him exactly two-thirds of the whole said sum in the first twelvemonth.* Surely that would have been more than "a pear for the thirsty," and every month of delay meant "a pear" the less; to say nothing of the mental anxiety. I fear we must adduce another old French proverb, *Qui s'excuse s'accuse:* with the best intentions in the world, Liszt had proved himself impracticable.

Just about this time a change is preparing in Wagner's prospects, from an unexpected quarter; but we need first to see how the shoe really pinched.

We have already heard of his fruitless attempts to mortgage the performing-rights of his operas. March 4, '54, he writes Liszt, "Am I worth to no German enthusiast at home a couple of thousand thalers for half a year? I will refer him direct to

* In vol I. of *Wagner and his Works*, p. 382, Mr H. T. Finck quotes from a manuscript letter of Wagner's to Johann Hoffmann (March 1857) preserved in Oesterlein's Wagner-Museum, "At Berlin every performance brings me an average of $60 or more. In course of the first year there were twenty-two repetitions." Mr Finck has turned Wagner's figures into American currency, but certainly does not over-estimate them when he says that Hülsen "had to pay the composer over $1300 in *tantièmes* the first year," i.e. over £260 at the most moderate computation.

my autumn takings." Those "autumn takings" could in no case have brought in a sum of between two to three hundred pounds, unless there came a sudden rush of theatres; but a little later we obtain a more definite estimate. Letter 162, written "on board the 'Stadt Zürich' on the Lake of Lucerne," * recounts Wagner's latest efforts to free himself from a position that has made it perilous *to return to Zurich*:—

DEAREST FRANZ,

You are reaching Leipzig at the nick of time for me. I regard your passing through Leipzig as a hint from Fate that there may be help for me *after all*. In my anguish of heart I wrote to *Brendel* also, a short while since, asking if he could not raise 1000 thalers on *note of hand* (for 4 to 5 months) among my Leipzig 'admirers.' Answer, No! but perhaps Avenarius might be able to manage it through So-and-so. As A. had lately paid me a visit, I wrote him also;† answer, No! Well, in course of the next three months will come my operatic takings for the year; by every token they will turn out well, and help me out of this last fix for good and all, I hope. The very least I can expect, in any case, would be the sum of 1000 thalers [£150]. So, whoever will lend it me, I can give him with good conscience a bill at three months (end of October). Härtel *must* do it. If on the other hand he prefers to advance me the *thousand thalers* on my receipts [*Lohengrin?*], it would equally suit me. He can best take stock of these receipts, and I would direct all payments of honorarium to be made to X until the sum is reimbursed.—Whichever he likes—only let me get out of this degrading plight, which gives me the torments of a jailbird! . . . Only in the hope that your assault on Härtels may succeed, can I *dare* return to Zurich. Nobody here can help me: I have already used *every* device to keep on end till now (from last winter). If all goes well, I shall resume the composition of the Walküre on the 1st of August. . . . Remember **July 31!!!**

From the urgency of the closing plea—probably referring to

---

* This letter is undated, but belongs to the middle of July; for it is in answer to that missing one of Liszt's "from the Rhine," and is intended to catch him at Leipzig, where, as we know from L.'s letters to Carolyne, he was expected on the 25th or 26th. The cause of Wagner's present brief expedition we shall learn next chapter.

† Eduard Avenarius, husband of Wagner's youngest sister. Kastner catalogues a letter of Wagner's to E. A. as of June 30 or July 1, 1854, beginning: "Do see if you can shew me a great favour for once."

some intimation already made to Brendel, c/o whom this letter would be addressed—it would seem that Wagner has had recourse to a Zurich money-lender, and that a promissory note or bill of sale falls due on the date last-named. But Liszt's efforts at Leipzig prove unsuccessful: "Härtel's counting-house offers an even more obstinate resistance than Silistria; with assaults one can do nothing there"—he writes July 28—"consequently I have no good tidings for you." The letter continues with the still more disconcerting news from Hülsen (331 *ant.*), and ends: "I am still much fatigued after my very hurried journey, and the personal feeling that I cannot serve you curtails even these few lines."

How Wagner tided over the immediate difficulty, will be a subject for inquiry next chapter. For the present I merely wish the reader to realise the acuteness of the crisis about the time when Minna started on a trip to Germany, the significance whereof has only lately become known. That she was despatched in the first place to spy out the nakedness of the land in Berlin, is not apparent; but through its nakedness in Zurich she of course was an equal sufferer with her husband. In addition, she had lately been suffering from symptoms of a heart-complaint that was to end her life twelve years hereafter. Last summer she had spent some weeks at a 'cure' (156-7 *ant.*); this summer the doctor has ordered her to Seelisberg, and in the letter of July just-quoted her husband says, "At this instant I'm floating on the Lake of Lucerne, from whose shore I am about to fetch my wife, who has been going through a whey-cure here." That also, you may imagine, had run away with money; and more had to follow it, to treat Minna to a holiday fully six times as long as Richard had been able to eke out for himself. Business, we shall see, was eventually combined with pleasure; but that was seemingly an after-thought of Minna's own; a convalescent's holiday it was meant to be.

August 8 Wagner writes old Fischer: "According to your last advices, I ought to have sent you money again for out-of-pockets [score-copying]; but money has been so infamously tight with me since last winter, that I have been quite unable to send any of my chance takings away. . . . In general, I am living a life of suffering, little as it may appear so to many a one—for I have grown silent about my inner man. Since last winter I've been

making music again, and work is the only thing that remains dear to me. . . . Next week my wife will travel to Germany, to see her parents once more. She will not go to Dresden, however, but get them to meet her at Zwickau; she will also visit Chemnitz [Wagner's sister, Clara Wolfram], and pass through Leipzig to see a lady-friend in Berlin. If you could make it possible to bid her good-day anywhere, she would be immensely delighted."

As said, it is not self-evident that there was any ulterior object in Minna's journey; renewal of family and friendly relations was in any case the first concern. Though she appears to have started mid-August, the next we hear of her is in her husband's letter to Liszt of Sept. 29 (no. 167): "My wife is now in Germany (originally for a visit to her parents). At present she is in Berlin (at Alwine Frommann's, Linden. 10). In eight days at the outside she will be in Leipzig (at Avenarius's, Windmühlengasse). Thence she will travel back by Frankfort: if she could see one of my operas at Weimar (naturally Lohengrin for choice), she would gladly put in a day there. If you can make it possible, please write her to Berlin or Leipzig; or else—if you can tell me *by return*—write *me* at Zurich, so that I may let her know in time."—Minna's itinerary may appear to have no interest for us: wait a while. For the moment I simply ask you to notice that her husband is so much in the dark as to what is hatching in Berlin, that he expects her to be leaving that city on the 6th or 7th, at latest, whereas she really gains a most important interview on the 9th. How little Wagner foresaw this new development, may be judged from his next letter to Liszt,* where we also get an insight into his present attitude toward *Tannhäuser*:—

WAGNER TO LISZT.—. . . I beg you not to tell me of my fame, my honour, my position—or whatever the thing may be called! I know with the greatest certainty that all my 'successes' are based on *bad*, very *bad* performances of my works; that they consequently repose on misunderstandings, and my public renown isn't worth a hollow nut. . . .

Hear me:—Tannhäuser and Lohengrin I hereby commit to the winds: I want to have no more to do with them; when I handed

* Letter 165 of the *W.-L. Corr.*, which should be ranged between 167 and 168, on internal evidence (2nd act of *Walküre* etc.). Its date would be in quite the earliest days of October, as it is an answer to Liszt's missing reply to 166, and asks "Are you writing my wife?"

them over to theatre-jobbing, I cast them off: I have accursed them to go begging for me, to bring me nothing else than money—*nothing but money.* Even to that use I should not care to put them, were I not—compelled to. With the insight at which I have arrived this summer, indeed, I would gladly bear the penalty of selling all my furniture etc., and again going forth naked as I was born into the world; where, I swear it you, this time no illusion should seize me any more. But—this time, I know, my wife could not support so violent a step; 'twould be the death of her. So, for *her* sake I have determined to hold out: *Tannhäuser* and *Lohengrin* must go to the Jews. But I cannot patiently abide the greater profit they might bring me under this or that conceivable circumstance, than now, when I must dispose of them at any price, and the sooner the better. Tell me, dearest, how stands it with *Berlin?* Did you merely rely on being able to make our condition plausible to Herr von Hülsen? Or had you other means in store, for securing yourself an honorific summons to Berlin? I really must almost believe the latter, and consequently fain would hope that you will very soon be able to tell me of our triumph. Berlin's abstention from my operas creates a stoppage in all the rest of the business—and—by God—the circulation of my operas means absolutely nothing but *business* to me: that is the only real thing about it; all the rest is purely and simply a sham.—O don't let us give ourselves the pains to extract any other earnestness from the thing, than that of lucre. I should have to despise myself now, if I tried to devote any other sort of attention to the thing.—The last song of the 'world' has died on my ear [Schopenhauer had just fallen into his hands]. . . .

Nothing save contempt is due the world: set no hope on it, no deception for our heart! The world is bad, *bad, fundamentally bad;* only the heart of a *friend*, the tears of a woman, can redeem it for us from its curse.—So let us shew it no respect, above all in nothing that resembles Honour, Fame, or whatever else its gewgaws are dubbed.—It belongs to *Alberich*, no one else!! Away with it! . . . I hate all *semblance* with a deadly hate: I'll have no hope, for that is self-deception. But—work I will.

Within two months the first idea of *Tristan und Isolde* will evolve, in whose poem we shall eventually catch more than an echo of these last few sentences. Our present concern is with *Tannhäuser*, and you cannot but agree that it were madness to stand out for ideal conditions of representation of an outlived work when the wolf was knocking so loud at the door. Some such sentiment Minna must have heard from her husband before or upon her arrival at Berlin, and it would naturally be endorsed

by her friend Alwine Frommann. This lady, a painter and reader to the Crown Princess of Prussia, would communicate with her employer, of whose interest in Wagner's works we have already heard.* Result: *Minna has an audience with Hülsen* October 9, and between them the ladies soon effect what bungling men had striven for in vain.

Minna shall tell her own tale in a moment, but we must follow her first to Weimar. On her journey thither we may assume that she spent two or three days at Leipzig with her husband's sister, as originally intended, also that the Avenarius pair advised her to avoid offence to Liszt by telling him nothing of the recent Berlin interview. Meanwhile we must not forget that one of Minna's wishes is unfulfilled as yet, the wish expressed through her husband to Liszt (Sept. 29) that she may hear his *Lohengrin* at last. Liszt having either suggested a difficulty, or left his friend unanswered, Wagner writes the following letter to Kapellmeister Gustav Schmidt of Frankfort,† which I reproduce in full, as it has only lately been unearthed and shews how considerate a husband Richard really was:—

WAGNER TO G. SCHMIDT.—Dearest Friend!

Best thanks for your last letter.—I am very sorry that—as it now appears—my wife will nowhere get a hearing of *Lohengrin*. Schindelmeisser also has to refuse, since it has been given twice already at Darmstadt this month, and a third performance so soon again would be too much for that small public.‡—I almost

---

* Dr Altmann remarks, "The Crown Princess's influence in the *Tannhäuser* affair seems to have been far greater than I can demonstrate here." And Frl. Frommann would be more responsible for that influence than Weimar itself, as she must have been a very old friend of the Wagners for Minna to be now staying with her. In fact I should imagine her to be the unnamed "lady" on whom the *Holländer* had made so deep an impression in 1844 (see ii, 52).

† Facsimiled in *Die Musik*, "Bayreuth number" for 1902, where we also learn that Wagner had previously written Schmidt on the 29th Sept. (same date as to Liszt): "My wife will pass through Frankfort about the middle of October. Do try to give her Lohengrin."

‡ To Schindelmeisser he had written Oct. 5: "Dearest Friend! My wife is in Germany at present; she will travel back by Frankfort (whither she has been invited by Schmidt for the representation of one of my operas) and will be there about the 20th inst. It would uncommonly please both her and me, however, if she could hear Lohengrin at Darmstadt. I therefore pray you to be good enough to manage it for her, and place yourself in rapport with

wish you could hurry up the *Ortrud;* then you might persuade my wife to wait with you for the performance, if it were only a matter of a few days.

The object of my wife's journey seems to me really half missed, if she cannot get a hearing of just this opera anywhere.

As soon as my wife arrives, please give her my love; I am merely waiting for a line from her, from Weimar, to write her again myself; I hope to receive that occasion tomorrow.

Accept my heartiest thanks, in advance, for all your kindness.

Zurich, 17. Oct. '54. Yours R. W.

Thus Minna was expected to reach Weimar about the 14th. The day after that, she hears the *Flying Dutchman* under Liszt,* and one rather wonders whether she made any remark on that close of the overture and opera not being given in the altered form. Having heard it four times at Zurich in 1852 and thrice in 1853, no matter how low we choose to rate her musical perception, she cannot but have marked the difference; from mark to remark, would be but a step, and we can well imagine such a remark, even though addressed to one of the younger Weimar flock,

---

her as to the day. She is to tell you—from Weimar—exactly when she can be at Darmstadt; so shew her the kindness of doing all you can to have her wish fulfilled.—A thousand thanks in advance.—Your R. W." (given in W. Weissheimer's *Erlebnisse*). Schindelmeisser, standing on a footing of much closer intimacy than Schmidt, is addressed with "Du."

* According to the *Neue Zeitschrift:* "On the 15th October, Wagner's Fliegender Holländer was given at Weimar for the first time in the new season. The excellent performance was received by the public with the liveliest sympathy; after the second act Hr. and Frau v. Milde, exponents of the principal rôles, were called with enthusiasm. Richard Wagner's wife, who had been spending a few weeks in Germany on a visit to her family—by no means, as some folk say, to bring about a production of Tannhäuser in Berlin—attended this representation." Among the curious features of this episode, perhaps none is more curious than the *date* of publication of that paragraph: without why or wherefore, it appeared among a mass of miscellaneous items in the issue for May 4, 1855, over six months later than the event it reports; whereas it would have been so natural to follow up the last instalment of the *Holländer* essay, Oct. 13, with this interesting little announcement on the 20th. Surely its object, at so remote a date, must be sought in the démenti of its last sentence; and that again can never have been inspired by Wagner, were it only because he then was in London, not troubling his head about *Neue Zeitschrifts.* From somebody at Weimar, somebody with a record of the repertory, it *must* have come.

causing a little "affront" if it reached Liszt's ears. That is sheer conjecture, of course; but it is a singular thing that not one word does Liszt breathe about this visit of Minna's, so far as we can trace, except in a colourless sentence to Rubinstein Oct. 19: "Madame Wagner will return to Weymar the day after tomorrow, and we shall give Lohengrin on Sunday [22nd]." The *Lohengrin* performance, an act of kindness in itself, whether improvised or not, did actually come off; nevertheless we should know nothing of it, were it not for a paragraph in the *Neue Zeitschrift* four weeks later (Nov. 17): "On the 22nd of October, Liszt's birthday, Lohengrin was put on again at Weimar, with Beck (the first who ever sang the part). The performance took place at the express desire of Frau Wagner, who had never yet seen this greatest work of her husband's on the stage." Even the lateness of the news is odd; still odder is the absence of any letter from Liszt announcing to Wagner two such exceptional events as Minna's first hearing of *Lohengrin* and the arrival—almost simultaneously with herself—of the *Rheingold* score! To the latter point I shall have to return in due course; but Liszt's silence on both may itself account not only for that excursion Minna made from Weimar, but also for that letter of hers which records it.

Why had Minna made this sudden loop from Weimar? Her husband writes old Fischer afterwards (Dec. 19): "My wife, who went to Dresden entirely behind my back, was hugely delighted with you. It quite warmed my heart." Yet it was on no mere friendly visit, that Minna had departed from the route mapped out for her. Again it was a surprise for her husband, and at least its ulterior object must have been withheld from Liszt, by its very nature. The little woman had evidently taken counsel with Frau Pohl (*vid.* 163 *antea*) and Francisca Ritter, both of whom had recently settled in Weimar with their husbands;*

---

* Bülow to Liszt, Sept. 19: "You have crowned all Ritter's wishes—beyond his most sanguine hopes. His ambition was for nothing but a place in the Weimar orchestra, at first without salary . . . He is leaving here this morning with his wife, who will not displease you, I fancy. She is eminently intelligent, even interesting, and has cleansed away all odour of the footlights since her marriage [Sept. 12]. My friend Sacha [Alex. R.] has radically changed to his advantage, through abandoning himself to her influence for some time past."—Francisca, you will remember, was Johanna Wagner's

the Grand Duke was made a party to the innocent plot; and thus we have the whole mise-en-scène for the intensely interesting letter she writes von Hülsen—in part, perhaps, at Wagner's dictation—as soon as she has got back home :—

MINNA WAGNER TO HÜLSEN, November 4, 1854.

Right honourable Herr General-Intendant.

Mindful of your kind assurances, I allow myself to relate to you the present state of the affair on which I lately had the honour to converse with you by word of mouth. Alike on my visits at Weimar, and after my return to Zurich, I have convinced myself that the only question now is how the formerly-proposed condition, of Herr Liszt's official co-operation in the production of "Tannhäuser" at Berlin, is to be withdrawn without exposing my husband's well-proved friend to undoubted pain. To me it appeared the fittest way, if it were made possible to my husband himself to come to Berlin, as the earlier condition would thereby fall through of itself.

I therefore decided to go back from Weimar to Dresden myself, in order to solicit in the highest quarter there permission for my husband to return to Germany. Supported by a letter of the Grand Duke of Weimar to the King of Saxony himself, I succeeded in obtaining a good reception of my suit; but it was signified to me that political acts, such as an amnesty, could not take place before a quarter of a year [King John having only succeeded to the throne last August]. Now, in case it might really be of consequence to you, Right honourable Herr General-Intendant, to bring out "Tannhäuser" this winter, perhaps Your Excellency might be in the very situation to accomplish this, if you would have the great kindness to have inquiry made through the corresponding authorities in Dresden as to whether there would be any objection there if Wagner were already to come to Berlin for a few weeks, merely for the purpose, however, of producing his work. After the mood I encountered in Dresden, I believe I may assume that an inquiry so honourable to my husband might of itself do very much toward hastening the amnesty of Wagner so much desired by myself; whereupon all hindrance to the presentation of his opera in Berlin would vanish at once. For that matter, Wagner would in nowise make a point of an official summons to Berlin, neither has he any

---

sister; very differently attached to her uncle, however.—Oct. 11 Bülow sends his "devoted regards" through Pohl to his wife and "Sacha's"; a letter that would reach Weimar perhaps a day before Minna, with the question, "What's the truth about the Tannhäuser-affair at Berlin, and the fresh fables concerning it one reads in the papers?"

idea of conducting his opera himself; simply, he would like the mere permission to be in Berlin at the time his work is being studied, and to help the spirit of the intended production through personal intercourse with the performers, without making further demands of any sort.

As, after the experiences I have made, I consider this the only way to get out of the condition regarding Herr Liszt; and as at the same time I can desire nothing more devoutly than that "Tannhäuser" should be produced right soon on the splendid stage under Your Excellency's command, so, encouraged by your kindliness, I venture the above petition with the assurance that by granting it you would render very happy a wife most heartily concerned for her husband's fate.

In the most agreeable hope, I remain with greatest respect

Your Excellency's

most obedient

MINNA WAGNER.

Now that we have followed all the steps leading up to it, this letter explains itself. The only point a trifle vague, is as to whether Minna had an actual audience with the new King of Saxony himself, or merely with Beust: probably the former, as she returns so sanguine of an "amnesty" that will not in effect be granted, even partially, for nearly six years yet. The next document will shew how entirely without her husband's complicity had been her seeking of that audience. It is an extract communicated by Alwine Frommann to von Hülsen, from a letter of Wagner's to herself, Nov. 14, 1854:—

WAGNER TO FRL. FROMMANN.—The permission sought, to come to Berlin myself, had no other meaning than to make retreat easy for Liszt: if I might come myself, the condition that Liszt should be summoned would drop of itself without affront to him. It was merely a way out, and I hope Minna mentioned that I wanted neither to be summoned nor to conduct, but simply to come to an understanding with the singers privatim. Under no condition should I wish to conduct my opera in Berlin myself now*; I have grown more

* To Liszt, March 4 of *last* year (1853): "I also have been thinking of the attitude I should adopt to Berlin, for instance, in case my return were permitted by then, and have come to the mature conclusion that even *then* I should entreat you to take over the production of my opera. Twice have I brought out an opera of mine in Berlin, and each time I have been unlucky with it; this time I should therefore prefer to leave the undertaking entirely

indifferent toward this earlier work since time has moved it farther from me, and I should not have the least objection if it were produced in Berlin now *without either Liszt or myself;* consequently if I were present now, it would be purely *out of consideration for Liszt*, not for my work, which I am already quite willing to commit to Berlin without conditions and with the fullest trust.

Further: nothing whatever could be more distasteful to me, than to be made the object of a democratic demonstration; which I could only regard as a fresh entire misunderstanding of my character. Wherefore, if Herr von Hülsen credits the Berliners with so little perception and common-sense, that he holds such a demonstration in my favour *possible*, please assure him that *I* should do more to avoid such an eventuality than *he* could to avert it.

If the steps taken by my wife completely of her own initiative* succeed in procuring me leave for a temporary return to Germany, even then I will come to Berlin only if I perceive therein the solitary possibility of letting Liszt retire unmortified. Should I learn, however, that this is no longer requisite for Liszt, I would gladly remain away from Berlin altogether. So, if "Tannhäuser" does not come out this winter in Berlin, it will not be due to *me*, but to *Liszt*, whom I cannot leave in the lurch, since he worked for my music when no one else had yet done aught for it. . . .†

If Liszt, on the contrary, withdraws without aggrievement, Herr von Hülsen may be sure that on my side there is not the smallest obstacle to his giving the opera next winter.

Presumably the closing words, "next winter," mean that of the present season 1854-5, in harmony with the previous paragraph and Minna's letter. Hülsen may or may not have answered that

---

to you, and at most regale myself '*incognito*' with your achievement. In any case, you alone are in a position to attune the relations and personal bearings there so much to my favour as is indispensable; *I*, on the contrary, should only spoil everything." That, of course, was before Liszt had developed his unexpected spirit of non-accommodation.

* To Liszt Wagner had said mid-July (Letter 162): "A. also wrote me about certain possibilities of Germany being opened to me awhile for a special journey. I do not believe it—and can't quite understand it at present: as to taking any trouble about it, I could not in the least." Since the paragraph is preceded by a reference to Avenarius, and followed by one to Berlin, it is uncertain whether that "A." stands for Wagner's brother-in-law or Alwine Frommann.

† The dots, the tantalising dots, are Dr Altmann's (if not Frl. Frommann's); the italics are merely a selection from his liberal use thereof, an attempt of my own to restrict the emphasis to its conjecturable pristine limits.

letter direct, though there is no record of such an answer in the archives; but the above shews him to have really feared lest Wagner's presence in Berlin might lead to political disturbances: so extraordinarily misled were the notions of the greater German Courts as to the artist's share in the abortive insurrection of 1848-9. At anyrate we may conclude that Hülsen did *not* apply to Dresden for a safe-conduct for Wagner.* So far, then, Minna's excellent device for sparing Liszt's susceptibilities has missed fire, though she has admirably broken ground with the redoubted Berlin Intendant.

Months roll on, and still we note no further progress. Why? Dr Altmann, who has thrown so much new light on parts of the transaction, observes that "a number of Frl. Frommann's important letters unfortunately appear to have been lost." Possibly that is so: yet our state of darkness is not absolute.

We have heard Liszt's testy declaration to Hans von Bülow (Sept. 30, '54), "Wagner is at perfect liberty to get Tannhäuser presented at Berlin whenever he thinks fit, and it is not I that will ever make him a shadow of reproach about it." We have seen that closely followed by Minna's "experiences" at Weimar, convincing her of Liszt's great sensitiveness on the matter of an official summons to be addressed to himself. Scarcely has her letter reached Hülsen, than Brendel appears to have heard vague rumours of a fresh turn in the negotiations, since this is what Liszt answers him Nov. 11 or 12:† "For the moment I can say nothing else about the Berlin Tannhäuser affair, than that I have *all along* (immer) made it perfectly free to Wagner to leave me quite out of the game, and to manage the thing direct according to his judgment, *without me*. So long as he bestows his trust on me as a friend, however, the duty is imposed on me to serve him

* Contrary to rumours which seem to have found their way into various German papers at the time; see London *Athenæum* Dec. 9, '54: "Foreign journals announce that Herr Wagner's 'Tannhäuser' is to be produced at Berlin; and that, to enable its composer to superintend the rehearsals, application will be made by Prussia to Saxony for the annulment of the sentence [not so!] under which Herr Wagner has been in exile since the days of the barricades at Dresden."

† The approximate date I deduce from Liszt's reference to a specified article "in to-day's number" of the *Neue Zeitschrift;* that issue being dated "Nov. 10," Liszt would presumably receive it on the 11th or 12th.

as a judicious (*verständiger*) friend—and that I can only do by lending no ear to negotiations conducted in that way (*derartig gepflegten Unterhandlungen*) and letting people prattle as they please. For the present say no more about it in your paper. The thing is stuck in a deeper rut (*steckt und stockt tiefer*) even than many an inexperienced friend of Wagner's supposes. I will make it plainer to you by word of mouth. Meantime I hold myself passive—for which Wagner will be grateful to me later on."

Now, does that accurately describe the position, or rather, so much of it as is here described at all? From the beginning of the 1854 negotiations down to his ultimatum of June, apart from the uncontroversial question of the fee, Liszt had not consulted Wagner on a single step until *after* it had been irrevocably taken. When he had already placed the matter in superior hands (the Grand Duke's and King of Prussia's) toward the end of that month, it is possible that he may have offered Wagner a nugatory "freedom" in that missing "beautiful letter from the Rhine" which Wagner answers, among other things, with the exclamation, "As regards the Berlin affair, rest assured that I'm glad to know it in *your hands* alone. I should be a fine fool if I wanted to take it out of them, so long as you're not tired of it" (330 *ant.*); but we must remember that Liszt's dearest confidante had only just *implored* the dramatist still to leave it to his friend "completely and entirely," thus rendering it to all intents a choice between the Berlin tantièmes and friendship with the Altenburg. Loyally had Wagner preferred the latter. Now his wife had intervened with a plan dictated by the keenest regard for Liszt's susceptibilities, but impossible for that very reason to communicate to him ere it should take effect. Some suspicion that Minna or Alwine was moving in the matter has evidently come to the ears not only of Brendel, but of Liszt himself, if we may judge by the expression "negotiations conducted in that way," * and at once the said susceptibilities are roused. Dear good Liszt, one itches to tell him, when a cart is "stuck in a rut" of your own ploughing, a "passive" policy will never pull it out! Somebody must put his shoulder to the wheel.

---

* Its continuation, about "people prattling," is singularly reflected in that démenti of next May (340*n ant.*), much as if the paragraph had been held over at Liszt's present request, and the *Lohengrin* one substituted for it.

But the tone of that letter to Brendel, from a writer who has taught us to "understand people, even when the real drift of their phrases is not expressed," may help us to fill up another gap. Numbered 160 in the *Wagner-Liszt Correspondence* is an unsigned, undated letter, nay, rather a five-line note. In its printed order, *circa* June '54, it remains a complete enigma: Herr Glasenapp therefore assigns it to the autumn of that year, an arrangement with which I thoroughly concur *per se*, though not with my esteemed colleague's application thereof.* As the note is so brief, I will give its actual wording, the late Dr Hueffer's translation, and thirdly my own slight paraphrase:—

Lass' Dir sagen, dass ich soeben vor Thränen nicht fortlesen kann.
O, Du bist doch ein einziger Mensch!—
Das hat wie ein Gewitter auf mich eingeschlagen! Gott, was hast Du mir da geschrieben!!
Du weisst's allein!

Let me tell you that tears prevent me from reading on.
Oh, you are unique of your kind!
It has struck me like a thunderbolt. Heavens, what have you written to me there?
You alone know it!

Beseech you! for tears I can read no farther.
O but what a singular being you are!—
This has fallen on me like a thunderbolt. My God, what a thing is this you've written me!!
You alone can tell!

Whether you accept Dr Hueffer's rendering or my own, I wish you to observe that "written me": by all laws of plain speech it refers to a personal and private missive, not to a public manifesto. Wherefore we must rule Herr Glasenapp's suggested application to the *Holländer* essay out of court, even had we not already seen that Wagner's first impressions of the essay were scarcely of a nature calling forth tears, either bitter or sweet. Certainly he thereafter speaks of that essay as having often struck him "with the force of lightning"; but there is a wide difference between

* *Das Leben Richard Wagner's* II. ii, 47*n*.

Blitzeskraft and *Gewitter*. Here we clearly have a staggering blow, a cry of the acutest anguish. When can that blow have fallen? Next chapter we shall meet a premonition thereof on the border-line of September-October '54, which I can no more than instance here, not to complicate the subject further. Judging by that premonition and Minna's "experiences," the Weimar atmosphere just then was highly charged; the "thunderbolt" must have fallen before, or within a few days of her departure. Some letter offering Wagner his "freedom" with regard to Berlin, in anything like the tone of that to Brendel, would account not only for this cry as of a smitten hart, but for very much besides—above all, for our possessing no letter of Liszt's to Wagner between July 28 and the first of next January.

Plainly, Pss Carolyne was the first to break the deathlike silence ensuing on this thunderbolt, and thus to elicit from Wagner the half-frightened admonition "Don't let us talk business! What are such trumperies to us?" in that often-cited letter 168 (mid-December '54). Without a murmur he has spurned the vantage gained by Minna and Alwine at Berlin, "not to leave Liszt in the lurch."

As if nothing had happened, perhaps not quite aware what had, Liszt himself reopens the subject with that sign of returning life, his letter of Jan. 1, '55: "I have heard nothing from Berlin —I will write to Alwine Frommann shortly." Again, Jan. 25—presumably after an answer from her, but *not* in reply to any intended hint of Wagner's—"As to Berlin and Dresden: alas! I have naught to tell you thence of what I would and wish and hope in spite of all. With bickerings and fiddle-faddles I have no desire to entertain you." The spontaneous coupling of Dresden with Berlin shews that Liszt had heard something at least of the Grand Duke's effort of last October; but, as he writes three weeks hence (in another connection), "The Grand Duke has been laid up in bed for several weeks, and I shall probably not be able to speak with him before a fortnight," his information from *that* quarter cannot be very fresh. Alwine must therefore have acted as his only medium, and it is not a little disappointing to find the conjecturable expostulations of that "inexperienced friend of Wagner's" dismissed as "*Quängeleien und Lapalien.*" Best for Wagner not to answer that remark at all.

A most intolerable situation. That Wagner should have cut it short with one stroke of the pen at last, is far less astonishing than that he should have allowed it to endure, so greatly to his personal inconvenience, for nine months since Liszt and Hülsen's rupture. The proxy, to apply a business term to an informal friendly instrument, should have *ipso facto* lapsed at the very time when Carolyne entreated its confirmation; no man of common-sense could dream of regarding it as perpetual, especially when the plenipotentiary had made himself the reverse of a *persona grata* at court. Yet that is how Liszt stubbornly chose to view it: in his eyes there was no "judicious" alternative between an official summons of himself and a veto on the next-best attempt to give *Tannhäuser* in the Prussian capital; he had worked himself up to a sense of being indispensable. And so the deadlock might have lasted for a generation, had not Wagner suddenly determined to pierce through a preposterous impasse at risk of a wound to Liszt's "feelings."

From London he writes March 14 (?),* '55—see how long he has patiently waited!—"Dearest Franz, I am in the silly position of having to demand of you an act-of-friendship of peculiar sort [countenance, evidently, of the white fib later on]. I *cannot* let this Berlin Tannhäuser concern continue at a standstill: my *monetary* situation is of too vexatious a kind, for me to let the prospect of Berlin takings be closed to me any longer.—Well, *Hülsen* now applies to me again (for the last time! he says) through Fräulein Frommann; he promises me everything imaginable; the opera shall come out next autumn; this very Spring the preparations shall commence. Now, I am obliged to view the matter trivially; just as, unfortunately, I have to view the whole fate of my operas. After all, in spite of Dorn's conducting, Tannhäuser will experience the same thing in Berlin it has experienced *everywhere:* to attach greater hopes to it, now appears to me vain. So let us leave the thing to go the only way—it seems—that go it will. Deeply do I regret that you should have had to expend so much trouble, and

---

* Again a departure from the printed order of the *W.-L. Corr.* is necessary. This letter "180" is plainly the one referred-to in "179" as having been despatched a day or two previously. Neither of them being dated, and Liszt's letter of March 12 arriving in London between the two, I confidently assign "180" to March 13 or 14, and "179" to March 16.

bear so many fooleries, on the fulfilment of my condition; but—it is obvious that we are powerless here!—The fate we shall suffer, will ever be a *common* one: whatsoever we strive to carry through, will always come most maimed and mutilate to show.—Accordingly I'm writing the *Frommann* that she is to say Yes to Hülsen without further conditions; that you yourself have advised me to do so: as in truth you will really thus escape—what I foresee as—a bootless struggle." The little white fib was amply justified in all the circumstances; more than that, it was palpably designed to shield Liszt from any appearance of being left out in the cold: the construction of the German sentence, however, does not make it clear whether A. Frommann, or merely Hülsen, was to be led to believe it.

March 15 Wagner writes Fischer,* instructing him to send to Berlin the *Tannhäuser* score returned to Dresden at the composer's request in January 1853. The very next morning, apparently, Wagner receives from Liszt a letter dated March 12 that pricks his over-tender conscience with an allusion to his "immortality" and vouchers of minor kind services, though it contains no word about Berlin. He replies at once: "Good Lord! I have just received your and M.'s ["the child's"] dear, dear letter! In my ghastly humour it quite bowled me over. You'll since have read† my letter with the abject decision as regards the Berlin Tannhäuser: in this affair I feel trivial, lofty and contemptuous, by turns. You have just revived in me the latter mood, and I fain would repent of having been trivial. It's almost too late, however. Through my giving up

---

* This letter has not descended to us, but, according to Dr Altmann's researches, it is mentioned in Fischer's transmittance of the score to Berlin March 22, '55.

† "Du wirst seitdem meinen Brief . . . erfahren haben": Dr Hueffer renders this "have heard of," which is out of the question, as the "letter" (No. 180) was addressed to Liszt himself. Unless "*erfahren*" is a misreading for "*erhalten*," i.e. "received"—which seems most likely—the word must here mean "undergone" or "suffered." It is unfortunate, as, coupled with the transposition of letters 179 and 180, it is just this fallacy of a first announcement through a third party that has lent colour to the accusations of callousness to which I have already referred, but which are triumphantly refuted by the real facts of the case now set forth. For the translation of "verachtungsvoll" as "contemptible," at the sentence's end, there is absolutely no excuse, unless it haply be that of failing eyesight.

Tannhäuser and at last *even* Lohengrin to the theatres, without further ado, I have made such deeply humbling concessions to the actuality of our deplorable art-affairs that I can scarcely now sink any lower! *Once more:*—How proud and free I was when I gave these works to *you* alone, for Weimar! Now I'm a slave and utterly powerless. One inconsequence draws after it another, and I can only numb my odious sense thereof by becoming still prouder and more contemptuous, in that I regard Tannhäuser and Lohengrin also as wholly discarded, no longer belonging to me, while reserving my *new creations* the more sacredly to myself and my true friends alone. That truly is my only comfort."

After so pathetic a confession, one would have expected an ordinary being to reply much as follows: Dear old fellow, is it *I* who have been standing in your light so long? Why *didn't* you tell me it plainly before? I should have liked to get full justice done your opera in Berlin; but, as they deny me my own conditions, of course I clear out of the way. At least it will mend your finances—which you'd be very unwise to neglect; so I congratulate Miss Frommann on having brought Hülsen to the scratch once more.—In less homely language, I fancy that is how Goethe would have treated Schiller; it certainly would have been the method of Hans Sachs. The only point Liszt had a right to take exception to, was the innocent fib about his "advice": that he either misses, or, catching its drift, approves in silence. Where he does shew soreness, is with regard to Frl. Frommann; forgetting that the Princess of Prussia, sister to his own Grand Duke, is likely to be behind her. Let him speak for himself, though, after a week of rumination*:—

---

* Letter 181 in the *W.-L. Corr.*, undated, but incidentally mentioning "Next Sunday, April 1"; so that we may assign it to Tuesday, March 27, as that is the date of a brief note from P Wittgenstein (effusive, but otherwise void of interest) which evidently accompanied it.—March 17, Liszt to Bülow: "At the moment of writing you, I have received a letter from Wagner which informs me that monetary considerations oblige him to yield in the matter of (*céder sur*) the representation of 'Tannhäuser' at Berlin, and that he has written to Mademoiselle Frommann and to Hülsen in that sense. I have no other objections than those which Wagner himself submitted to me 18 months ago. From the moment he passes them over (*qu'il passe outre*) I have

"Over the Tannhäuser affair in Berlin we will not let a hair turn grey. I foresaw this coming, albeit for my own part I neither would nor could contribute to it. I willingly concede to your Berlin friends the satisfaction they find in this issue to the thing, and hope that many another occasion will present itself when I may not be superfluous to you or in your way." Smooth it down as you please, it stings. Had the Weimar friend and protector ever read that line in *Hamlet*, "Rich gifts wax poor when givers prove unkind," I wonder? Not that the rest of the letter is not couched in the usual affectionate terms, and signed "Most heartily and unwaveringly loyally Thine"; but this short paragraph stabs cruelly, and no less cruelly if heedlessly, at the heart of a man who for nearly a year had renounced his own material interests to spare his comrade's pride a wound.

Nothing could be more affecting than Wagner's answer,* when viewed in the light of our recent discoveries:—"Ah dear Franz! In your amiable way you have punished me! Regarding this Berlin business I have greatly reproached myself: at anyrate I was in too much of a hurry, and—as my manner is—wound up the thing too quickly. I ought to have begged you, as you really had my proxy, to end by giving Hülsen the opera—without further condition: †—that would certainly have been better, and no doubt you would have seen to this last transaction also, to please me. But unfortunately the whole affair had long become so repugnant to me, that I had lost all elasticity in its regard, and felt driven to end it as hastily as possible, so as to have no more to do with it. As for that, don't hunt among my 'Berlin friends' for the spur to this

---

nothing more either to say or to see in this affair. Tannhäuser, then, will be given at Berlin this autumn, and I shall have news of it through you." Apart from its being a full week before Liszt writes Wagner himself on the subject, we have here another instance of his careless reading: Wagner had not said that he had already written both A. Frommann and Hülsen, but most distinctly, "I am writing the *Frommann* that she is to say Yes to Hülsen" etc.—*Ich schreibe somit an die* Frommann, *sie soll dem Hülsen ohne weitere Bedingung zusagen*—underlining "Frommann." Perhaps it is significant, that Hans's fairly long reply to Liszt (Mar. 27) is absolutely silent as regards this interesting announcement.

* Letter 183, undated; apparently of March 31.

† "Ohne weitere Bedingung": another point omitted by the late Dr Hueffer; most unfortunately, as it makes all the difference, that being the rock on which the former negotiations had split.

decision; it was simply the pecuniary situation in which I am placed, already detailed to you, that made me totally unfree upon this point. I *had* to think of raising money. Thus, too, I have asked 100 louis d'or advance on royalties, but surrendered the opera outright without any further conditions; just as everything connected with my operas, in truth, has now become wholly indifferent to me."

Here I will break the letter an instant, to deal with Wagner's self-reproach. Honestly, what might have been expected if, bowing to a point of etiquette, he had asked *Liszt* to write Hülsen? Supposing Liszt consented, there was always the danger of his employing the selfsame tone that had proved so disastrous before. Supposing Liszt refused—as indeed he must have, after the rupture of diplomatic relations last summer, with a strict regard to etiquette all round—the effect on Wagner would have been so dispiriting that the opportunity might have been lost for good. Promptitude was absolutely essential here; it was Hülsen's "*last*" offer: therefore Wagner's line of action was undoubtedly the best. Only his loyal generosity can have dictated this self-reproach, and it is that generosity itself which has exposed him to the reproofs of many who could not "read between the lines" what is now confirmed by independent evidence adduced above: the common fate of men less gentle to their own "feelings" than to those of others.

But Liszt had set his heart on superintending the Berlin *Tannhäuser*, and nothing could please Wagner better *if* it still might be managed. So he continues his letter: "Viewed strictly, this would in nowise have debarred fulfilment of my wish that you should be summoned to Berlin for the production of Tannhäuser; since that never really lay in the Intendant's power, but the King alone can suspend traditional usage. . . . So that this still remains a matter quite apart, whose adjustment would have to be sought from the King direct. Only—it seems that you haven't a prospect of that. What could be done, then, to get something out of the King after all? Might I have the impudence to write to him myself, and perhaps attempt in my style what seems to refuse to come off in another? The thought of seeing my wish fulfilled in spite of all, is the only one that shews me this Berlin opera affair of a sudden in an interesting light again. What do you say to it??—"

Liszt says *nothing*. He answers not at all for a month, though Wagner positively lavishes praise on a sonata of his a few days later. Finally, May 2: "Dearest Richard, I had nothing agreeable or of weight to say to you, and so I have not written you a long while. . . . During these latter weeks I had spun myself entirely into my Mass, and yesterday I finished it at last. I don't know how the thing will sound—but perhaps may say that I have rather *prayed* over it than *composed* it," etc. The dots,* in this instance, are the work of the German editor: whether they correspond to an allusion to Liszt's home-affairs or no, I cannot say; if, on the other hand, they represent some reference to Berlin, the omission is significant. At anyrate Wagner does not return to the subject in his answer of May 16, "Heartiest thanks, dearest Franz, for your dear letter, which I had been waiting quite long for. The prospect of seeing you again at last, in September, is my only light in the night of this sorrowful year," etc. Silence on that one sore point enduring for some time to come, we will return to business.

Following up his commission to Fischer of March 15, a week later Wagner had sent Hülsen the following:—

WAGNER TO HÜLSEN.—Your Excellency

I hereby notify that I have given instructions in Dresden to forward you the score of my opera "Tannhäuser." Accordingly I yield you this work for production, without attaching further conditions thereto. Merely I have the wish that an advance of one hundred Friedrichs d'or should be made me forthwith on the tantièmes to be paid me in the future, as I otherwise might very possibly draw no revenue therefrom for another year.

With distinguished respect
I remain Your Excellency's
most faithfully
RICHARD WAGNER.

22 Portland Terrace, Regent's Park.
London, 23. March 1855.

Purely a formal letter, as Hülsen, apparently, had made no direct reply to Minna's of last November, and Alwine Frommann would already have been entrusted with all necessary communications. With what joy the news was welcomed in Berlin, a pardonable exultation over a diplomatic victory, may be judged from Hülsen's

* *Omitted* in Hueffer's translation.

letter of March 26, '55, to the Minister of the Royal Household, von Massow, whom it was needful to consult regarding the payment on account:—

HÜLSEN TO MASSOW.—At last we have succeeded in obtaining for performance Richard Wagner's latest opera "Der Tannhäuser" without the conditions set up before, of allowing its rehearsals to be managed by the virtuoso Liszt.

With a work that has made the round of all [?] the large cities of Germany with the greatest success, I have felt obliged to shut my eyes to the political sentiments of the composer. I believe we may expect those successes to be shared in Berlin, and therefore believe I ought to withhold no longer from our public the representation of "Tannhäuser," indisputably the most important musical dramatic product of the present day.

Meanwhile the composer begs me to grant him an advance of 100 Friedrichs d'or on the tantième to be accorded him. Convinced of the certain success of his work, I have no hesitation in letting him be paid this portion of his tantième-honorarium already, as it will accrue to him after the first four performances, and simply beg Your Excellency most obediently for the favour of your consent thereto.

The mounting of this opera will follow somewhere about the month of November or December of this year.

This document tells us many things. In the first place, that Hülsen was not particularly well acquainted with the opera in question, or even with his country's literature; otherwise he would not persistently have called it "Der"—much as if one said "The Luther"—nor would he have held it to be Wagner's "latest opera." Consequently it is no personal enthusiasm that prompts his eagerness, but a motive far more potent with such a functionary, the "confidence in its certain success" derived from the business experience of others.—Secondly, it shews that he was by no means of an ungenerous or unyielding disposition, however philistine, since he gladly falls in with Wagner's bare "wish" that an exception be made in his favour and a substantial sum paid in advance.—Thirdly, it proves how indelibly Beust's renewed Warrant had branded Wagner in the eyes of the other big Courts, when Hülsen has actually to excuse himself to a colleague for overlooking "the composer's political sentiments."—Fourthly, it perhaps betrays the secret of the long-standing friction between the Berlin Intendant and Liszt: "Endlich ist es gelungen, Richard Wagner's neueste Oper 'Der

Tannhäuser' zur Darstellung bringen zu können, indem die früher gestellten Bedingungen, die Einstudierung durch den Virtuosen Liszt bewirken zu lassen, beseitigt sind." To a fellow court-official Hülsen had a perfect right to describe the Weimar Court-Kapellmeister in Extraordinary as "the virtuoso Liszt," if he knew no better; but if Liszt was thus treated at that dinner-party in Gotha (313 *ant.*), were it merely by an inflection of the voice, it would account for much of his insistence on "official" recognition, as also of his chagrin at the present turn of events. Berlin had been one of the great scenes of his triumphs as "virtuoso" a few years back, and we can easily understand his desire to wipe out all memory of that kind of triumph by appearance in a character 'society' would deem far higher, that of the accredited equal of the Director of a great Court-theatre. At Leipzig he had yielded all along the line: Berlin was much bigger game. That "amour-propre" which he now confesses, now proudly-humbly denies, may well have been at work here. It was a Lisztian weakness in fact, due to the Magyar element in his blood; on the occasion of that very festival for which, at the Emperor of Austria's behest, he had been "praying over, rather than composing" his Mass, he writes Carolyne (Sept. 2. '56), "The day of the consecration [Gran Cathedral] I was not invited to the Primate's table—and excused myself from the other table, as also did" a few other Hungarian notables.

But I must get to the end of the tale before I sum up.

April 7, '55, von Massow signifies his assent to the advance from the theatre's coffers, and on the 17th Wagner sends formal instructions for the money to be paid to his friend Jakob Sulzer (why, we shall see next chapter). May 11, not having been advised of its receipt as yet, he writes again, renewing his request, and is answered that the 100 Friedrichs d'or—about £85—had been sent to Sulzer on the 9th.

An account of the actual production (Jan. 1856) would be premature just now. Provisionally to round the matter off, however, I should mention that everybody behaves quite nicely in the end, and Liszt does attend a rehearsal or two, by invitation, though without "official" imprimatur. There had been a little preliminary skirmishing, apparently, between himself and Wagner; for Liszt writes in July '55, "By word of mouth

I shall have more to say about London, as also on some other business matters," and Wagner answers, with reference to that promised meeting (which did not come off, by the way), "Reflect that this will be a *summit of our life*, in view of which all lower things must already be set straight and conquered. I reckon on your magnanimity!" and seemingly a fortnight later (no. 194), "But why do you not answer my last question??"—as if there were some omission in the printed form of his last. Then Liszt announces in September (no. 197), "Johanna Wagner has been here [Weimar] since the day before yesterday [to see her sister] . . . I was several hours with her last evening. So Tannhäuser is to be produced in Berlin next December." The purport of that "So" ("*soll also*" etc.) is not transparent, but it looks as if Liszt and Johanna had exchanged rôles for once, and *she* were lecturing *him* on *Tannhäuser*. At all events, in October he writes his comrade: "At the beginning of November we are to have a performance of Tannhäuser in honour of several Berliners (Hülsen, Dorn, the operatic regisseur, Formes [tenor] etc.) who have announced themselves for a visit here." So the hatchet was buried at last.

I have dwelt on this particular episode in Wagner's outward career at unusual length, for various reasons :—

1) It formed a very considerable factor in his financial troubles. Not only were the Berlin tantièmes of sufficient moment in themselves to be worth a hard struggle for, but on the adoption of "the rebel's" work at the chief capital in Germany depended its countenance by most of the other Courts.

2) This episode has hitherto been almost totally misunderstood, and in consequence the reverse of justice done von Hülsen by many who did not reflect that in vilipending him they were putting a very poor complexion on what then appeared to be Wagner's sudden capitulation to the enemy. They also forgot that the master himself, even after Hülsen's by no means civil letter to him of October 1852, still spoke of the Berlin Intendant as "personally a thoroughly well-disposed man." Hülsen, formerly a military officer, accustomed to order men about, no doubt was brusque; nor does he seem to have been very highly-cultured. He was not only a good business-manager, however, but a man of his word; and, had it not been for the

mischief-making of Albert Wagner, with his ridiculous "Wow-wows," *Tannhäuser* might have appeared at the Berlin opera-house three years before it did. That Hülsen had no personal inclination toward Richard Wagner, is quite another matter; but the long letter written him by the composer *after* the production (a letter to be given the reader hereafter) will demonstrate that Wagner entertained a high and grateful opinion of his conduct at this period.

3) We have seen Minna not only playing the part of peace-maker in very skilful fashion, endeavouring to reconcile her husband alike with Dresden and Berlin, striving her hardest to procure his amnesty; but also displaying a wifely interest in that only opera of his she had not heard as yet. The poor half-invalid has quite enough to answer for in other respects, for us not to forget these saving graces.

4) In the relations between Wagner and Liszt the tendency has mostly been to magnify the disposition of the latter at expense of the former, and more particularly to praise his "superior tact." Their characters were entirely different; so much so, that there must have been a large fund of lovableness in both, for them to have journeyed at all well together: but this episode has proved that, when variance arose between them, it is not necessarily Wagner that must bear the blame. And as for "tact," it would have been far better if Liszt had submitted to his homelier comrade those letters to Hülsen *before*, not merely after, sending them; better still, if he had made his long-promised visit,* were it simply to Basle again, and talked the thing quietly over. Instead thereof he assumed the attitude of principal rather than 'second,' and in such a provocative tone as to bring about what nothing but Wagner's courtesy saved from degenerating into a triangular duel. Here it is

---

* Listen to Wagner's gentle reproach of April 1856: "My heart feels the need of spending at least a part of every year near *you*, and you may be sure I should make more frequent and protracted use of the liberty to visit you, than you do." June 8, '54, Liszt had written, "I shall bring you my Symphonic poems as soon as it is possible for me to get away from here for a fortnight"; but a month later we find him on his way to attend a stupid music-festival at Rotterdam, merely as audience, though he does combine it with a meeting with his daughters at Brussels. The proposed '55 visit, on the other hand, is frustrated by a chapter of accidents.

impossible to absolve Liszt from a charge of letting his personal amour-propre get the upper hand of his friend's necessities; though I hasten to add that his office of intermediary was originally embraced from the same unselfish motives that prompted so many and many another act of kindness, not only to Wagner, but to scores of lesser lights besides.

5) We have had an absolutely typical instance of Wagner's intense delicacy with regard to the "feelings" of others. A momentary irritation might throw him off his balance, at times; but *his* sympathy was deeper-rooted than all distinction between Me and Thee, and the idea of inflicting pain on any friend was as much a torture to him as if it were himself. Throughout this affair he behaved splendidly. Only when the cup was offered him for "the last time," the cup that held spiritual dregs as well as material comfort, did he seize it—and reproach himself for thinking of his personal needs.

VIII.

DIE WALKÜRE COMPOSED.

Article on Gluck's Iphigenia *overture.*—Walküre *music begun.*—*Sitten festival affair. A visitor from Cologne. — Composition resumed. Act i: a melody and a 'motive.' Musical Murrays.—Abortive scheme for concerts in Belgium and Holland; Weimar a little huffed.—A twofold liberation.—Act ii: Wotan's monologue; Fricka scene; musical 'reminiscences.'—Act iii: results of an analyst's misnomer.—The composition ended.*

Brünnhilde sleeps.—I, alas!—still wake!
WAGNER to LISZT.

THE Berlin complication forms a background to the composition, ay, the scoring of *Die Walküre*, just as an earlier phase thereof had cast its shadow across the final filing of the whole RING poem. But the musician's power of detachment far exceeds that of the verbal reviser, and little trace of mental distraction, though much of sadness, is there to find in this first supremely great work of the full-grown master.

The scoring of *Das Rheingold*, as we have seen, was finished May 28, '54: on that day month, **the 28th of June 1854**—according to the 'sketch' until recently in the possession of the late Frau Wesendonk—**the composition of Die Walküre is begun.** The interval, originally intended for much-needed relaxation, had been rudely broken by the "brief and disagreeable correspondence" with brother Albert re Berlin (326-7 *ant.*). Then toward the middle of June, in that undated letter "in the sign of the eagle," we heard that "the Walküre is thrilling finely through my every limb"; yet on the 17th is signed an article on *Gluck's Overture to Iphigenia in Aulis* which opens thus: "With one large artistic work completed, and on the eve of beginning another, I'm simply waiting for fine weather: but just to-day there's so much grey in the

heavens and over the earth, that wellnigh none save theoretic crotchets will come to me for sport." The remainder of the paragraph acquires a new significance in the light of that disagreeable correspondence aforesaid: "Still, for all this incubus of grey, I'll not sink so low as engage in a polemic with any of my adversaries. On the contrary, I feel most peaceably disposed, since I continue to make the experience that so many who have formed a real acquaintance with myself and works have given me their cordial friendship; compensation enough for the opposite experience, that many still pursue their path of bragging to themselves and others that they know a thing or two about me."

To this miniature essay—it covers but ten pages in the *Prose Works* (III.)—I have already referred in connection with Wagner's revival of Gluck's masterpiece at Dresden (vol. ii). It is the younger master's only contribution to prose literature since his Explanatory Programmes of the *Dutchman* and *Lohengrin* overtures a year ago, and is followed by no other until his Letter on *Liszt's Symphonic Poems* in 1857. We therefore may spare it a few minutes' hearing.

Elicited by Brendel's repeated requests for something wherewith to grace the columns of the *Neue Zeitschrift*, perhaps this contribution was meant as a douceur to coax him to energy in beating up private subscriptions to that wished-for loan from "admirers" in Leipzig (335 *ant.*). However that may be, from a technical standpoint it constitutes the real foundation of the future pamphlet on *Conducting*, since it contains a brief but clear exposé of those methods of the author, "modification of tempo" etc., which will so arouse the ire of London critics nine months hence. Here particular notice should be paid to the following: "Everything I have recommended, however, must never be carried out glaringly, but always with the greatest refinement—as with all like added nuances; wherefore one really cannot be too guarded in communications of this sort"—a remark that might well be laid to heart in these days of the opposite tendency, namely to sensational new readings.

Passing from technique to "content," an ironical reference to the writer's self as "a poor amateur who can trust himself to deal with music only when he may hope to realise poetic aims therein" leads on to the pregnant observation that Gluck "asked nothing from an overture but all an overture can give at best: suggestion"

—or "stimulus" (*Anregung*). Glancing back across more than 13 years to the old Paris period, we read in Wagner's article *On the Overture* that its "general artistic end is to act as nothing but an ideal prologue, to translate us to that higher sphere wherein our mind prepares itself for Drama. Not that the musical conception of the drama's main idea should not be brought to most distinct expression and a definite conclusion; on the contrary, the overture should form a musical artwork complete in itself. In this sense we can point to no clearer and finer model for the Overture, than that to Gluck's *Iphigenia in Aulis*. Here, as in the overture to *Don Giovanni*, it is a strife between, or at the least an opposition of, two hostile elements, that lends the piece its movement . . . This solitary contrast, pursued throughout the piece, directly gives us the great idea of old Greek Tragedy, since it fills us with terror and pity in turn. Thus we attain a mood of lofty excitation which prepares us for a drama whose highest meaning it reveals in advance, and thereby leads us to understand the ensuing action itself according to that meaning.—May this glorious example serve as rule in future for the conception of all overtures, and demonstrate withal how much a grand simplicity in the choice of musical motives enables the musician to evoke the swiftest and distinctest understanding of his never so unwonted intentions" (*P.* VII. 161-2).

Written but a few months before the *Dutchman* overture, which already expands the rule in one direction, it is curious to see how the fundamental idea of the above may be made to point quite different ways, and justify forms so entirely distinct as those of the *Tannhäuser* overture and the introduction to *Rheingold*, or yet an otherwise-contrasted pair, the *Lohengrin* prelude and the introit to *Walküre*. The form is not the vital factor, then, and must vary with the character of the work; but the main principle underlying both these utterances is that of the "suggestion" or "stimulus" to be supplied by an overture. And here, though Wagner will have meantime written his *Meistersinger* overture much on the old *Tannhäuser* pattern, it may be of service to look forward to what he says a quarter of a century hence: "For the introduction to 'Rheingold' an austere simplicity sufficed, which I had as little cause to abandon when the 'Walküre' was to be introduced with a storm, the 'Siegfried' with a tone-piece conducting us into the depths of Nibelheim's Hoard-smithy . . . all

three were *elements* from which the drama had to quicken into life. Another course was needed for the introduction to 'Götterdämmerung'" and so on (*P.* VI. 185). Each work is to be judged on its own merits, yet they all have this in common: the idea that the overture must be no mere pretty potpourri, or what Bülow wittily calls "a funeral vase for the opera's ashes," but actually attune us either for the whole drama or for its opening scene. And it is not a little significant, that Wagner should return to a consideration of this overture of Gluck's on the eve of so important a step as the composition of the first 'day' proper of the RING.

Twice had he conducted the work in the preceding winter (p. 219*n*), out of compliment to Jakob Sulzer, the Zurich friend here referred-to as having "expressed the wish to hear something of *Gluck's* for once in a way"; which gives rise to a characteristic remark: "I found myself in a dilemma, as I could think of nothing else at first, than the performance of an Act from one of Gluck's operas, and that at a concert. Between ourselves, I can imagine no more hideous travesty of a dramatic, especially a tragic piece of music, than to have Orestes and Iphigenia, for instance, in evening-coat and ball-dress, with big bouquet and notes in kid-gloved hands, proclaiming their death-agonies in front of a concert-orchestra. I suppose it must be my 'one-sidedness,' but where an artistic illusion is not wholly at work on me, I cannot be even half-satisfied—a thing that comes so easily to every musician by trade." Now, if you will look back to the programme of the Zurich Wagner-concerts in '53, you will find not a single *dramatic* scene from any of his operas, though there could have been no difficulty in presenting the great duo from the *Holländer;* the same with his selection of Nine Vocal Pieces from *Lohengrin* for separate publication, and again with his choice of samples for performance at the London Philharmonic in 1855. Strongly against his will, solely driven by the necessity of collecting funds for Bayreuth, did he allow extracts from his more strictly dramatic works to be performed at concerts in after years; and the same artistic principle underlies his protest against the vocal part of the closing scene from *Tristan und Isolde* being delivered on the platform.

An act or scene from one of Gluck's operas thus ruled out of court, there remained "his most perfect instrumental piece," the

overture that forms the subject of this unique article. But since those Paris days Wagner had learnt what he appears to have been unaware of then, namely that the overture to *Iphigenia in Aulis* has "no ending of its own, but leads straight into the opera's first scene." It was Mozart who had "devised the ending" habitual in the concert-room, and Mozart's ending proved most unsatisfactory when rendered in the proper tempo of the overture —which the older musician had failed to discover for himself. So the article is accompanied in the *N.Z.* (July 1, '54) by a sheet in full score, containing Wagner's own new Close,* evidently written during the early weeks of *Rheingold's* composition, consisting merely of 33 bars "in which there luckily is as good as nothing of my own invention," but "a final resumption of the earliest motive of them all, simply to terminate their changeful play in such a fashion that we reach an armistice at last, though no full peace. As for that, what lofty artwork ever gives a full, a comfortable peace? Is it not one of the noblest functions of Art, merely to kindle in a highest sense?"

Seriousness thus is mingled with the wit and mordant irony of this brief excursion (in which Messrs Fétis and Bischoff get their knuckles exquisitely rapped), whilst the whole thing ends with a sunny harbinger of return to creative work: "See!—the grey sky is clearing, growing bright and blue: I set you free. Make shift with this product of grey-weather spleen, and wish me luck for more congenial labour!"

There still remain eleven days before the *Walküre* music is commenced, and the delay is probably to be set down to a couple of visits that certainly fell in this month of June. First would come Carl Ritter, Wagner's erewhile pupil, for Bülow tells

---

* Liszt writes Jan. '56: "Schlesinger of Berlin is publishing a new edition of Gluck's overtures in full score (dedicated to myself), and wishes to supplement Mozart's ending of that to Iphigenia in Aulis by your own"; to which Wagner replies: "I've no objection to the use of my Close to Gluck's Iphigenia overture, as I have already made it public. It would be reasonable, however, if the overture itself were to appear with the right tempo and a few needful marks of expression. Apart from that, Herr Schlesinger perhaps might accustom himself to a better tone towards me in his musical paper, provided Herr M[eyerbeer] will allow him."—The Wagnerian Close and tempo etc. are those now generally adopted.

Liszt June 29, "Charles Ritter wrote me the other day from Vevey, where, in his capacity of bridegroom, he is mirroring his honey(?)-moon in the lake of Geneva. He has been to see Wagner at Zurich, and passes me on a number of his impressions regarding the 'Rheingold' music. Have you read the manuscript of his 'Alcibiades'? I imagine this piece would not be without interest to you; for my part, I think it a little chef-d'œuvre containing some admirable episodes." Evidently Carl left a copy of his *Alcibiades* with Wagner, for the latter writes Herwegh hereafter, "Please read the accompanying comedy of Karl Ritter's as quickly as may be. You will thereby do him a pleasure, and I have to reproach myself with having left his wish, that I should shew you the piece, unfulfilled for over a year." We shall catch another echo of this visit presently, of a similar nature to that already recorded anent the second visitor, Eduard Avenarius (335 *ant.*).

June 28, the flat on the Zeltweg free of company once more, the composition of *Die Walküre* is begun in the pencil-sketch, with that realistic silhouette of a storm of wind and hail, where Donner's blows connect this opening with the closing scene of *Rheingold*. The music must have been brewing to some purpose in its composer's "every limb," since a week has not run out before he writes Liszt, July 3: "When are you coming? I'm going into Wallis [Canton Valais] in a few days' time, but shall be back very soon—I've no money to be gadding about, nor does anything attract me but my pleasure in my work. The Walküre is commenced: my! how the thing begins to hum at last!*—Curious these contrasts, between the first love-scene in the Walküre and that in the Rheingold!" Surely, he cannot have progressed as far as the second half of act i. Unless, then, he is simply speaking of the music still within his head, we must read the first scene between Siegmund and Sieglinde as already a "love-scene," as indeed some parts of its music suggest. What really *is* curious, however, is that Wagner should dignify Alberich's advances to

---

* "Du, jetzt geht es doch erst los!"—As the German is very colloquial, a scrap of English slang must be excused. Dr Hueffer's "The *Valkyrie* has been begun, and now I shall go at it in good style," does not convey the sense of the original, namely that the *Rheingold* music was a mere 'preliminary canter' when compared with that just commenced.

the Rhinedaughters with the name of love, though those nixies themselves, perhaps the clumsy dwarf too, may thus have regarded them. But we will not split hairs over an ejaculation in a hurried private note.

Only a few more days can have been devoted to the first spell of work at *Die Walküre*—shall we break it with the entry of Hunding?—for that expedition into Valais is pressing. A grand festival of the "Allgemeine schweizerische Musikgesellschaft" had been announced to take place at Sitten (better known by its French name, Sion) in July, and the central committee—all men of Federal-government rank, with Moritz von Wyss as Zurich correspondent—had invited Wagner to conduct the whole. Token though it was of his growing celebrity, he had no desire to make so great a plunge into the unknown, as he writes Liszt May 2, '54: "I flatly declined, but declared myself ready to undertake a Beethoven symphony (in A) if they would appoint a special conductor for the whole festival proper, and if he agreed thereto. They jumped at it, and engaged a Berne bandmaster, Methfessel —who really is devoted to me. In their public notifications, however, it seems to them useful to make it appear as if I had undertaken the direction of their 'music-festival' *jointly* with M.* Perhaps that was what surprised you too?" It would have surprised a good many, and will help to account for the dénouement. Let Wagner continue: "For that matter, there is nothing 'musical' to be expected of this convivium; I'm alarmed at what I hear about the orchestra that is to be assembled, though the most doubts are expressed as to the gathering of a decent choir. Moreover, as these people are only granting *one* rehearsal, you may easily understand why I did not commit myself deeper, to say nothing of any idea of propagandising there. True, they

* So late as June 14 the *Neue Berl. Musikztg* prints an announcement from Sitten: "Das zweite grosse Musikfest der Schweiz wird hier stattfinden; Richard Wagner leitet die grossen Musikaufführungen und Methfessel, Direktor in Bern, die Oratorien." A notice in the "Foreign" columns of the London *Musical World*, June 24, 1854, will spare me the pains of translating, as it is evidently derived from the same source: "Sitten.—The second grand Swiss *Musikfest* will be held here. Herr Wagner will direct the general music, and Herr Methfessel, director in Bern, the oratorios." Whoever may have been responsible for it, the statement was misleading.—A subsequent notice in the *M.W.* (Sept. 16) mentions Mendelssohn's *Lobgesang* as one of the works assigned to Methfessel's care.

lately approached me with the request to present something of my own, and I conceded them the 'Tannhäuser-overture,' but solely on condition that I saw it would go: I must have the option of withdrawing it after rehearsal." All the preliminaries thus shew how extremely qualified had been Wagner's assent. As he goes on to tell Liszt, it had merely been a pretext to his own conscience for "an Alpine outing, across the Bernese Oberland," on which he had invited Hans and Joachim to keep him company. The latter having promised a visit this summer, "he might as well do a little 'music-festivaling' in Wallis too," and "if he had a fancy for the opportunity of giving me something to hear for once, I could certainly procure his definite engagement."

With Joachim as leader of the violins, perhaps also as soloist, the amorphous Sitten "convivium" would have been worth looking forward to; so Wagner writes Liszt again June 7: "Your question about the music-festival has almost made me hope you'll be able to accompany me thither.—That would indeed be a joy for this sorrowful year!!—And if you could go the length of bringing the princess and Child for a journey across the Oberland and Gemmi into Wallis,—oh, oh!—then all would be well!!! Only, expect nothing from the silly festival itself. I have withdrawn all my compositions; I merely conduct the Symphony in A; there will be a great gathering of people, maybe, but not much music. Were you there as well, perhaps also J. and B.,—then God knows what one might extemporise, purely for our *own* 'amusement'!"* But Liszt went off to hear Handel's *Israel* and Haydn's *Seasons* at Rotterdam, while the princess and "child" of course remained at home, and Bülow writes Liszt June 29 from Dresden: "To my great regret I have been unable to accept Wagner's invitation for the festival at Sitten. But one who might well have done it, and has been very wrong in not wishing to, is Joachim. I have just heard that he has gone to Vienna for his summer vacation." Probably if Joachim were asked his reasons, he would give the quite sufficient one, that this Swiss concert was too trumpery an affair to tempt him all that distance. In any case Wagner is less exacting than impulsive young Hans,

* Cf. the remark about Berlin p. 325 *antea*.

for he writes Liszt next January: "I must produce something of yours in London: give it your thought. Give a thought also to Joachim at anyrate; when I get to London, I shall soon bring that about," certainly implying a wish to get the violinist engaged for the Philharmonic.* As said, however, these two came into no more contact.

Quite alone, then, does our hero make his journey to the Rhone valley, with no particularly bright anticipations. He appears to have arrived in Sitten on Sunday July the 9th, as that evening a Frl. Henriette Rordorf, one of the festival singers, writes her relatives in Zurich that Wagner had sat opposite her at table-d'hote, "and I find him very pleasant when one gets to know him. There was a great draught in the room, and I asked him whether he could bear it, adding that he seemed to be fond of air. He replied that it might be harmful to myself, 'But there! you have survived The End of All things in Berne; after that one can bear anything.' He kept saying that he felt so odd—and I can well believe it—but the thing would pull through."† Since Frl. Rordorf had been singing at Berne in Spohr's *Last Judgment* ("Die letzten Dinge"), the allusion must be taken as a mere bon-mot, certainly not as a slight on the friendly old composer.

But the Sitten affair did not "pull through," so far as Wagner was concerned. He found himself confronted with an orchestra *in spe* of no more than 55 (including 8 first and 8 second violins) even when it should attain its full strength, and largely composed of amateurs. Albeit Methfessel had already given the core of the band a few preliminary trials, it would naturally be impossible to extract a decent rendering of Beethoven's masterpiece from *one* rehearsal, which itself must necessarily be limited by the demands of the other works set down for performance. Tradition has it that Wagner did not even attempt a rehearsal at all, but after "an animated conversation with Methfessel in the concert-room" suddenly departed from Sion, leaving a "somewhat drastic letter

---

* Joseph Joachim (born 1831) had already appeared at a Philharmonic concert in 1844 as a mere boy, and had made visits to England in 1847, '49 and '52, but did not return till 1858.—See *Grove's Dict.*

† Quoted by Herr Steiner, together with the extract from the *Bund*, in his *Neujahrsblatt* of 1902.

to be delivered to the committee that evening, with excuses founded on the insufficiency of the orchestra, and of the horns in particular"; which mysterious letter is supposed to have been "incorporated in the society's archives," but lost thereafter! Another "eye-witness's" legend dispelled, as usual, by documentary evidence; for the local correspondent of the contemporary Bernese *Bund*, inspired by no excess of friendly feeling, as you will see, records the incident as follows:—

The arrangements in the church (where the festival concerts were to take place) answered all requirements, but the locality itself left much to be desired in acoustic respects. Richard Wagner, who had arrived on Sunday, was present at this rehearsal. Sensitive and nervous as he is, perhaps the not yet fully-manned orchestra, the locality itself, or insufficient occupation and many another thing, may have failed to meet his subsequent [?] demands and wishes, and thus combined to put him out. At the midday meal his ill-humour was only too visible, and in the evening Herr Direktor Methfessel received a polite request from Herr Wagner to be so kind as take over the conducting of the Symphony in A, as he was leaving by the next post. Both things happened.* His sudden departure created a sensation only insofar as one had expected more republican self-denial from a man of Wagner's democratic tendency, presupposing that he would form a better estimate of circumstances and regard the object of the festival not alone from a purely artistic or individual, but also from a social standpoint, especially with a view to the *future;* the more so, as in the event one had reason to be satisfied with the execution and success. He might have effected much, and won himself friendship, thanks and recognition, at trifling pains.

---

* Quoth the correspondent of the *Musical World* (Sept. 16), with a rich sense of proportion: "After his arrival, Herr Wagner refused to execute the charge entrusted to him, because he considered the orchestra too weak. Hereupon, Herr Methfessel stepped forward, in a noble manner, free from any professional envy, and conducted the whole." No doubt it was obliging of Methfessel, but even to suggest the idea of "professional envy" on the part of a simple 'under-study' is highly diverting. The *M. W.* makes amends for the solecism, however, by informing us that "the choruses were very imperfectly rendered. Some of the solos, however, were very satisfactorily sung, and the orchestra, which certainly was weak, did its best." Still more to the point: "no person could be found last year to direct the *Musikfest*. It almost experienced the same fate on this occasion as well, and, in fact, it can hardly be expected to be ever very successful, if only from the remote spot where it takes place."

Now, as the festival took place on the 12th and 13th (see *Mus. World*), and this report obviously refers to the 10th, it is clear that Wagner did not throw the committee over without giving them a chance of getting the symphony played through before the public performance, as there would still be one intervening day. It is also shewn that, with the best of good-will, he had arrived in ample time, and actually held as much rehearsal as he was allowed; for "insufficient occupation" proves that he had *some*, though not enough to satisfy him. But, with an orchestra "not yet fully manned" on the very eve of the festival (originally announced for the 10th to 12th), and "many other things," what would a Berlioz or Richter have done, for instance, save resign? The political glosses on his act are really too amusing, a comic pendant to the terror of the Berlin courtiers on the other side. In what capacity had Wagner been "called in"? Not as an apostle of "Democracy" or prophet of "the Future," but simply as a conductor with a famous name, a financial 'draw' in fact. Naturally it was upsetting to the organisers of the feast, to have their only notability throw them over at the eleventh hour; but what else had they any right to expect, if they failed to provide him even with the most ordinary materials? As well ask a Michael Angelo to dash them off a fresco with a child's box of paints. The gospel of these worthy Federals, in art-concerns at least, seems to have been consistently based on the maxim of asking everything from the "individual" and giving him nothing in return; not even the wherewithal to work his benefactions.—On its own merits the case would scarcely have been of importance enough to discuss; but it shews how very poorly a great artist is likely to fare in the "republic of the future," and at like time proves how little solid chance there was of Wagner's 'Bayreuth' theatre being built in Switzerland. One refusal to desecrate a symphony of Beethoven's suffices to get him rated as a political renegade.

On the Philistine chief-town of Valais he turns his back, rather in terror than in anger, the evening of July 10: "I have decamped from the Sitten music-festival"—he writes Liszt a few days later (no. 162)—"to me it was like a big village-fair, in whose music-ing I had no fancy to join. I cut and ran!—No more 'music-feasts' of any sort for me! . . . Yesterday morning I left the lake of Geneva; last night I spent in the diligence from Berne to Lucerne." As the lake of Geneva was far from the shortest route

home, we may guess that the detour meant a return-visit to Carl Ritter at Vevey and an effort to obtain his assistance to meet that bill, or whatever it was, that fell due "July the 31st!!!" Probably Carl was unable to help on the spur of the moment, yet it must have been *he* that enabled Wagner to return to Zurich at the end of the month without fear of immediate disaster; for Herr Steiner speaks of a sum of 3800 francs as to which Wagner writes Sulzer next May, "Since the fatal debt to K. Ritter will be finally liquidated by the autumn, I hope I shall no longer need to apply my theatre-receipts merely to my current expenses." We therefore may take it that shortly after the letter to Liszt of mid-July '54 Carl advanced to Wagner his family's whole annual subvention (about £150), to be estopped during the coming twelvemonth.

The most pressing need thus met, Wagner returns with his wife from Seelisberg on the lake of Lucerne about the end of July, at Zurich to "resume from August 1 onward the composition of the Walküre. Work—*this* work—is the *only* thing that makes life bearable to me. I shall go on with the fair-copy of Rheingold at the same time; and you shall have its score in your hands—I fancy—by late autumn." However unpleasant its beginning, the brief outing had laid in a store of good "impressions," for he writes Liszt some weeks later: "Seelisberg is the dearest discovery I have made in Switzerland. Up there it is divine, so beautiful that I'm longing to go up again—to die there!—There must we meet next summer: I think of writing my Young Siegfried there . . . How pure my heart is when I think of it!" To the beauty of the lake of Lucerne, just as to that of the lake of Lugano and the bay of Spezzia with *Rheingold*, we may accordingly assign a large share of the marvels of *Die Walküre*. On his return thence the composer plunges into his music with a vigour unrivalled before: "I'm working too hard. For me the whole day has but one meaning, to give me a good frame of mind for the utmost quantity of work," he writes Fischer, Aug. 8; and the jealousy with which he guarded his precious morning-hours is confirmed by the following reminiscence of August Lesimple's, a young pilgrim from Cologne:—

"My first meeting with Richard Wagner was at Zurich, in August 1854. Armed with a letter of introduction from Weimar, I was sure of gaining admittance. On my morning call, his wife

Minna received me in his stead, and, after kind greetings, informed me that her husband always devoted the forenoon to work, but my visit would be acceptable to him in the afternoon. The impression I retain of her is that of an amiable and engaging person; in her features one could no longer trace the reputed beauty; pain and trouble had set their stamp upon this face.—Time hung heavily on my hands till the hour arrived at which I was to make acquaintance with the eminent man. When I presented myself in the afternoon, I was shewn into his study. The abode was tastefully, but not luxuriously furnished, all the rooms communicating through heavy curtains. Richard Wagner, in whom the Weimar note had evidently awakened pleasant memories, soon appeared and gave me a most friendly welcome. I fancied it the best way of ingratiating myself, to talk about the successful production of his 'Tannhäuser' at *Cologne* [last November]. But he seemed to have great doubts of my optimistic reports, declined to believe that his work had made the right effect, and supposed its success must be due to a very good tenor. I did not disguise from him that there was a strong opposition at work in Cologne—as he knew already—to prevent the public from coming to its senses. The names were well enough known to him [Hiller, Bischoff, etc.]. Wagner then dilated on the faultiness of operatic performances in general, and how rare it was for a work to be reproduced according to its author's intentions: as Kapellmeister in Dresden, he had had to fight a perpetual battle; nevertheless, after difficulties of all kinds, he had succeeded in bringing off a model representation of Gluck's 'Iphigenia in Aulis,' and its effect had been splendid and lasting. Apropos of the sketches for 'Walküre,'* which lay before us on the piano, Wagner next told me of his plans for the future: how he aimed at finishing his 'Nibelungen' within two or three years and then producing it in an out-of-the-way town, and only before a circle of invited guests, of whom he could be sure that they would receive it with affection; *once* would be enough for him, as he merely wanted to shew the idea in his mind of a national art-

* Lesimple, by an obvious slip, calls it "*Siegfried.*" His reference to Gluck's *Iphigenia*, also, points to some forgotten remark of Wagner's about his lately-published essay on its overture, for which the young man's allusion to Hiller would offer an opening (see ii, 184-5).

work. 'For my own part,' he added, 'house and work may then go to ground [cf. iii, 227]; my object, the task of my life, will have been accomplished.' With a thrill in his voice he told me that he owed all he had attained to his friend Franz Liszt, without whom he would probably have been clean forgotten.—This memorable chat left me full of enthusiasm for a man who was endeavouring to prepare such noble goals for German art. I told him I would report to him on 'Lohengrin,' to which we were soon looking forward at Cologne [Jan. 4, '55], and with a hearty shake of the hand he said farewell. I felt most strongly drawn to him, and remained from that day forth his loyal henchman, making it my very next task to work for his ideas at home with energy. Years passed ere I met him again . . . Who once has looked Wagner in the eyes, can never forget that deep, unfathomable light that shone from them,—there was something miraculous in those eyes. He himself set great account on a person's look, and I well remember his telling me that he could read the whole man from his glance" (*Richard Wagner:* Erinnerungen von A. Lesimple, Leipzig 1884).

From about the middle of August to quite the end of October Wagner was left in single blessedness, Minna taking the holiday narrated last chapter. To this period belongs the greater part of the composition of *Die Walküre*, a work that shews a closer continuity of inspiration than any other, with the possible exception of *Tristan*. The scene in which Hunding figures on the stage may perhaps bewray the earlier manner here and there, perhaps halt at times of domestic intrusion on its author's privacy; but from the moment that Siegmund—and Wagner himself?—is left alone, act i is one unceasing flow of melody, and of melody the equal whereof not even a Weber had conceived. We may elevate our eyebrows at the first dozen bars of the Spring-and-love song; but see how wonderfully the musical themes are weft throughout this portion of the act without a trace of effort. It is full mastership already.

Again I have no intention to attempt a musical analysis; yet I wish to dwell upon a point or two, in illustration alike of the subtle use to which its author puts his system of "*Leitmotive*," and of the danger of accepting as gospel the hard-and-fast labels invented by his commentators:—

Down to the entry of Hunding we are supposed to know nothing of the relationship of Siegmund to Sieglinde, any more than they themselves are supposed to divine it until much later in the act.* It is not the age of mirrors, and the twins have had no opportunity of comparing their faces; but Hunding, distrustful of his purchased wife, is straightway struck with amazement at the resemblance: "Wie gleicht er dem Weibe! Der gleissende Wurm glänzt auch ihm aus dem Auge," he mutters aside. At once the bass clarinet plays the motive of Wotan's spear, so gently that we should scarcely remark it if we had not become quite familiar with the theme in *Rheingold*. 'Tis but a hint of coming revelations, but it invests Hunding's aside with a significance much greater than he himself is aware of, and excites us to attentive interest in Siegmund's autobiographic sketch. Then as the hero's narration reaches the disappearance of his putative father "Wolfe," with "eines Wolfes Fell nur traf ich im Forst: leer lag das vor mir, den Vater fand ich nicht," after the horns have just hinted the metamorphosis-theme (*alias* Tarnhelm-motive) the trombones tell us by two bars of the Walhall-motive *ppp* whither "Wolfe" had vanished, and our first foreboding is confirmed: that spear-motive, we say to ourselves, had been no accidental ornament. And by the time Sieglinde in turn tells her story, when the Walhall-motive enters softly once again, but with fuller instrumenting and development, we hearers know for certain what neither Siegmund nor Sieglinde knows as yet. Nothing but the leitmotiven-system could have put us in such possession of an essential clue, thus linked this section of the drama with the prologue.

Another question is that presented by the use of the so-called Renunciation-motive in the voice itself, at Siegmund's words "Heiligster Minne höchste Noth" etc., as he grasps the hilt of the tree-sheathed sword. It is a twofold question: that of the

* In course of two very clever articles on the first half of this act—*Mus. Wochenblatt* 1902, nos. 43-49, and 1903, nos. 13-22—Herr Moritz Wirth contends that Sieglinde's gradual recognition of her "long-lost brother" is definitely completed when he reaches the words "zu zwei kam ich zur Welt," contrary to the general opinion that no such recognition is even remotely conceived until *after* their mutual avowal in the final scene. I must confess that Wirth's inferences from the music do not convince me. For his suggested slight changes in the by-play and the scenic arrangements, on the other hand, there is much to be said.

difference between a balanced melody and a 'motive' proper; and that of the real meaning to be attached to an independent motive which the commentators of the past quarter of a century have not merely derived from a very brief clause in this melody, but followed each other in designating by the same conventional name as its alleged source, thereby leading to endless confusion. The melody itself constitutes the musical setting of those words which the poet, or rather the reflective projector, once viewed as the key to the whole tetralogy (see iii, 442), and no doubt with a little perverted ingenuity one could shake from out it quite a number of the leading themes in the first two sections of the work; but its cardinal feature is the *contrast* between the power of Love and that egoistic power which can wrest the purest element to its own base uses. From one end of the melody is very soon formed the motive of the Ring, that symbol of relentless Egoism; from the other end is said to be formed, among other things, the motive of Freia's golden apples—by no means a symbol of renunciation. Let us take a look at the notes themselves, as sung by the Rhinemaid Woglinde, to whom it is quite inconceivable that any live being should emancipate itself from the rule of love: "He who the sway of love forswears, he who delight of love forbears, alone the magic can master that forces the gold to a ring"*:


WOGLINDE: Nur wer der Min-ne Macht ver-sagt, nur wer der Lie-be Lust ver-
3
jagt, nur der er-zielt sich den Zau-ber, zum Reif zu zwin-gen das Gold.

That is the melody which, or a part of which, has been universally dubbed the "Renunciation-motive" (*Entsagungsmotiv*), some applying this label to the whole, others to its second bar and first note of the third, others again to these and the bar before. The

---

* From Mr Frederick Jameson's very close translation now embodied in Messrs Schotts' pocket edition of the full score. Mr Alfred Forman has a touch more poetic freedom: "Who from delight of love withholds, who for its might hath heed no more, alone he reaches the wonder that rounds the gold to a ring."

last arrangement is the most logical of the three, as it recognises that a 'motive' must be short, on the one hand, while refusing to decapitate it on the other. To be still more logical, one would have to make the label take cognisance of an important part of the idea, and call it "Renunciation of Love"; but, as that would interfere with the interpretation arbitrarily placed on its supposed derivative, both mother and foster-child have gone out into the world under one and the same cognomen, a cognomen confounding the energetic prefix *Ver-* with the more or less passive *Ent-*. To avoid confusion, I will provisionally call them simply "X" and "Y," and, having just given X, will quote two typical forms of Y, one from *Rheingold*, the other from *Siegfried* (act iii), where you will notice that the lapse of many years has made little or no difference in its mode of treatment; the clarinets are almost invariably concerned in it, associated with the sad oboe, *cor anglais*, or bassoon:



Now I think it will be of interest to glance at X's antecedents. I do not know if anyone has yet remarked it, but the first half of melody X bears a striking resemblance to the first theme of the Andante in Weber's great A-flat sonata, op. 39, more especially in the slight modification undergone by that theme on its last appearance:

Obliterate the first note in the 1st and 5th bars of Weber's theme, and the general likeness is palpable; add an A natural to Wagner's, where the rest comes after "verjagt," and the core of his melody is note for note identical with the second half of Weber's, or rather, as it would *sound* on a piano that did not 'sustain' well. Then, if you *must* have a parentage for motive Y, you might easily find it in the second chief subject of that

selfsame sonato's Allegro; here again, most markedly in its changed aspect just prior to the 'recapitulation' section, where its expression is significantly indicated "*con duolo*":

As a matter of fact, though Weber's themes occur in different movements of his sonata, they have a closer interrelation than Wagner's X and Y. Nor is it at all improbable, on the face of it, that Wagner unconsciously drew both ideas from this work of his forerunner's; for its Menuetto also has a figure, bars 23 to 32 after the first repeat, which distinctly foreshadows the shimmering violin accompaniment to the first appearance of the Rhinegold-fanfare.* And I fancy we may even trace its channel of transference. Wagner himself, of course, could never have attempted to play such difficult pfte-music as Weber's; consequently there is little likelihood of its having formed a part of his library at Zurich. You will remember, however, that Liszt visited him in July '53, and "played incredibly," whilst the two were together again for about ten days in Paris that October—the month before *Rheingold* was taken in hand. Such a brilliant piece as this Weber sonata was absolutely certain to belong to Liszt's repertory (hereafter he 'edited' it); equally certain would he be to play it to so devout a worshipper of its composer. The rest is simple: an echo or two would haunt Wagner's ear for some time afterwards, perhaps without his actually recalling their source, until they worked themselves to absolute and intimate possessions of his own, with all that individuality a master-mind confers on themes "the like of which one may have heard before" (*cf* 184*n ant.*).

Curiously enough, within a few weeks of the completion of

---

* Still more pronounced is the likeness to the *Siegfried* "forest-murmur" and the *Tristan* "rill" (act ii), but these would derive from *Rheingold* itself, now that the idea had been made Wagner's own.—So pronounced as hardly to be distinguishable from plagiarism, is the likeness borne by the Invocation in Sullivan's *Iolanthe* (1882); but Mendelssohn (*M. N. Dream*) and all his school were constantly laying Weber under contribution—without paying compound interest in the way of the great.

Liszt's *next* visit to Zurich (1856) we have another sonata of Weber's, the equally elaborate op. 49 (D minor), obviously furnishing a suggestion for act i of *Siegfried*. Turn to the second half of the first section of this beautiful work's Allegro, and you will find a passage marked "animato assai," continued for two dozen bars; with the repeat and a reappearance in the recapitulation section, it constitutes a very prominent feature of the movement, and is of a nature that lays strong hold of one, not lightly to be shaken off. Now take Siegfried's Hammering-song, marked "schwer und kräftig, nicht zu schnell," and you will meet this grand old friend in a new embodiment: it is not a resurrection, or a wax effigy such as Mendelssohn costumed in his Allegro giojoso (op. 43), but a positive reincarnation. That Weber himself, for all his fertility of resource, would have been able to transform his passage into this still more virile shape, I doubt; but the heir of Beethoven *cum* Weber here shews his spiritual ancestry beyond mistake.

And yet another parallel does the last-named sonata supply, bars 49 to 57 after the brief repeat near the opening of its Rondo. This time the next of kin is to be found on the one hand in the rippling brook of the Pastoral Symphony, on the other in the opening scene of act iii *Götterdämmerung*, especially noticeable where the Rhinedaughters plunge beneath the waves and reappear at Siegfried's offer of the ring. Can the idea have been latent in Wagner's brain through all those years, or had it lately been resummoned by some other pianist? No matter: the glorious expansion and development now given to that Rondo's fleeting figure would justify the plainest annexation; could Beethoven and Weber hear it in their graves, one feels, they would raise their hands in blessing.

But I have strayed from our X and Y. To them we have yet to add a "Z," which makes no distinctive appearance till *Siegfried* iii, though Loge had come very nigh it in his "was wohl dem Manne mächt'ger dünk' als Weibes Wonne und Werth?" (*Rheingold*, scene 2, where it significantly springs from the Freia theme):



Z also had been classed as a "renunciation" motive, if distinguished from X and Y at all, until Dr Julius Burghold quite recently laid bare * the absurdity of thus designating a theme that accompanies the Wanderer's words to Erda, "um einen Mann zu minnen als Weib" and Siegfried's ecstasy as he stoops to kiss the sleeping Brynhild. Dr B. has changed its name to *Hingebungsmotiv*, which we may accept if we take the word in its meaning of "surrender." So far, that is a decided help, particularly when we remember that motive Z accompanies Brynhild's much-debated expression in *Gtdg* ii, "Er zwang mir Lust und Liebe ab." But Z, as you will observe, is simply a variant of Y, and the change of labels should have been carried farther. From Y, too, we must strip all notion of "renunciation," if we are to make any sense of the music, i.e. if we are to make it what the composer intended it to be, an elucidation of the text. In scarcely more than two or three instances can one twist Y into any sort of harmony even with passive renunciation; *per contra*, when a voluntary renunciation is really expressed we *never* hear Y (or Z either). In the closing scene of the tetralogy, where the heroine does in fact renounce, there is nothing remotely resembling this theme; in the scene where Wotan joyfully renounces his ambitions, "dem ewig Jungen weicht in Wonne der Gott" (*Siegfried* iii), we hear the absolute antithesis of Y in the shape of that ideal theme of exaltation commonly but inadequately christened "World-heritage," the kinship whereof to the *Parsifal* Grail-theme positively leaps to the eye:

* In a series of articles "Ueber die Leitmotive in Richard Wagner's Ring des Nibelungen und ihre Benennung," originally published in *Die redenden Künste* 1897-8, and thereafter reprinted as a brochure. Most of Dr Burghold's changes of denomination have sound reason on their side, though there still is some room for improvement. It is a great pity that his luminous essay has not been used as preface to the new edition of the German textbook (Schott & Co.) where Burghold has most helpfully indicated on the margin of each page the various motives in the corresponding portion of the score, and by an ingenious arrangement has enabled the reader to keep their musical notation continually under his eye. As it is, the brochure's format forbids one even to get it bound with the text, besides being inconvenient to handle apart.

What does Y mean, then? Wherever you meet it, you will find it associated with the idea of compulsion, subjugation or oppressedness. The first of its two examples quoted p. 376 is followed by Donner's "Zwang uns allen schüfe der Zwerg" (*Rh.* 34), the second accompanies Erda's "mich Wissende selbst bezwang ein Waltender einst" (*S.* 75). It is *Zwang* throughout, expressed or implied; a deprivation of freedom, physical or mental; a bending to the will of others, or subjugation to one's own desires (even in its Z form with Siegfried's ecstasy). Hence it should oust from its title that "Bondage" motive which comprises but its first two notes, and which Dr Burghold rightly calls *Wehe-motiv*, motive of pain or woe, from its frequent association with that word. You may derive Y's first three notes from melody X if you please, providing you notice that they fall there to the words "Minne Macht," i.e. the compelling *sway* of love, whereas the "versagt" ascends of its own volition; but you would do far better to remark Y's organic relation to the chief instrument of *Zwang*, Wotan's spear, bearing in mind the connection between bondage and bond, the "runes of bargain" (*cf* Judgment-theme *Loh.*).

I had prepared an elaborate schedule of all the appearances of X, Y and Z, throughout the tetralogy, but cannot spare the ten pages it would cover, so must refer the German-reader to Dr Burghold's admirable brochure, where he will find much besides to interest him. To explain Siegmund's use of melody X, however, we must first glance at Brynhild's use thereof in the Waltraute-scene of *Gtdg*, since both are acts of intense *rebellion:*



Here Brynhild sings the core of X, and follows it with what would be the ordinary form of Y were it not for her leap to F that interrupts the motive at the word "Liebe." And here we must note the energetic ascent to "nie," exactly as with the "versagt" and "verjagt" of Woglinde's utterance; also the idea of *Zwang* in the words of the second verse. But the leap to F is the characteristic feature here, bringing Y into line with a theme just heard, whose sense may be gathered from

its occurrence at her words "der Strafe Sinn" in the ensuing scene. Here is no conflict between the sway of Love and lust of Power, but the egoism of "love" itself has become a devastating element; and an almost maniacal effect is produced by the extraordinary change of key and theme which signals the heroine's next utterance, "stürzt' auch in Trümmern Walhall's strahlende Pracht." No longer is she protected by ignorance or oblivion of the baneful character of what she refuses to part with, and straightway the Curse-theme sounds its tocsin.

If this be one of the most intensely dramatic moments in the whole tetralogy, little less so is that when Siegmund grasps the hilt of his promised sword. In *Die Walküre* we naturally do not look for the same intricacy of musical structure that makes the much later *Götterdämmerung* (and act iii of *Siegfried*) so fascinatingly inexhaustible a study; yet with one bold stroke the younger master has accomplished what could scarcely have been achieved by complexity. He bodily transfers to Siegmund's voice the whole first half of Woglinde's love-*versus*-power melody, X, musical key and all; its second half he simply expands in such a way that the climax is much more strenuously arrived at; and upon the very note that in *Rheingold* had announced the ring he introduces the new heroic power, "Nothung" the weapon of Need, working that also out to a still higher climax, completed by the orchestra in the brilliant C major of the Sword-motive itself:


(Very quick)
SIEG-MUND: Hei-lig-ster Min-ne höch-ste Noth, seh-nen-der Lie-be seh-ren-de Noth,—
brennt mir hell in der Brust,— drängt zu That und Tod:— Noth-ung, etc.

Surely this is clear as noonday; a deliberate restatement, conscious on the composer's part, of the problem mooted in *Rheingold*. There none but he who wilfully set love aside, could win the selfish power encircled in the ring: here none but a man impelled by the utmost "need" of love could win the symbol of heroic power, the power that does great deeds itself, not merely forces

others to work at its egoistic behest. "Deed and death" is Siegmund's motto, not *fear* of death, the spectral haunter of the ring's possessor. How easy would it have been for Wagner, in the plenitude of melodic inspiration evinced by the whole of his *Walküre* music, to have given his hero an entirely new melody for his new evangel; but Siegmund is arch-rebel, and nothing could better mark the height of his rebellion than this triumphant wresting of an old adage to a revolutionary meaning. With him Love says, "I came not to send peace, but a sword." There lies the bond between his own and Brynhild's rebellious utterance: the old saws about "renouncing love" shall be put to confusion; 'tis the "holiest" need on earth, and gives man courage. With the ultimate consequences of his gospel we are not concerned here, but Siegmund, unloved and unloving, has hitherto found nothing round him save oppression, and at this supreme moment of his destiny it is Love that nerves his arm to break the fetters; not a shadow of Alberich's ring has crossed his longing, nor does a shade of Alberich's menace fall aslant this scene. When Siegmund falls, it will be in open and heroic combat for love's sake.

That at least is how I interpret the surprising quotation of the "renunciation" melody in act i of *Die Walküre:* Siegmund flatly contradicts it, inasmuch as he makes its "love" part lead *up* to the sword, not be crushed by the weight of the "ring." To those who may not agree with me I offer an explanation of long and extensive currency from Wolzogen's "*Führer*," frankly admitting that I am about to traverse it: "On this guilt-stained love weighs Alberich's curse, that will break even the treacherous god-given sword. When Siegmund, with the superhuman strength of love's highest god-descended ardour, draws the sword from the stem, to place himself in strife with fate and ur-law, he vows himself to death and consequently to the tragic compulsion * of renouncing love. Wherefore at the words 'Heiligster Minne höchste Noth' the deeply-awing sounds of the Renunciation-motive accompany this winning of the sword, which for Wotan's hero has symbolically taken the place of the gold-symbol, just as they had accompanied that ideally parallel robbery of Alberich's. But the

* Wolzogen unconsciously uses the word "Zwang" here, as does Burghold in his general explanation. Another step would have taken them to a better designation of our motive Y.

tragic truth of these tones exists at present for us hearers alone; the two dramatis personæ exult over the deed with the Sword-motive, the Hero-theme, and the Cry-of-triumph, whereupon they draw Spring's love-benediction also into their jubilation."

Now, it is with the greatest reluctance that I join issue with so universally esteemed an author as Freiherr Hans von Wolzogen, to whom we all owe many a debt; but the above is a striking instance of the way in which attempts to draw a moral lesson from a work of art may blind an expounder to the actual facts. Here the rôles of orchestra and dramatis personæ are unaccountably reversed by my honoured friend: the latter do *not* sing any but the last of the themes mentioned in his closing sentence, whereas the so-called "Renunciation-motive," far from being an "accompaniment the tragic truth whereof exists at present for us hearers alone," is positively put into the hero's mouth, as if for living refutation. Moreover, so little is our melody given to Siegmund himself by a mere accident or caprice of the composer's, that he has deliberately altered the original text (see 16 *ant.*) in order to bring in the "Minne" and "Liebe" from Woglinde's adage on their identical notes, and has introduced the idea of "That und Tod" to leave no doubt as regards the meaning of that "erlag" at the end of Siegmund's dithyramb.* The hero is fully conscious that he is rushing into the jaws of death, but it shall be in the "laughing house of Spring" (cf. end of *Siegfried* poem), not amid any "deeply-awing sounds" of Renunciation; and though our melody is written now in notes of twice the nominal length of its first appearance, the whole passage from "Siegmund heiss' ich" to his actual winning of the sword is marked "Very quick" (*Sehr schnell*). As for Death being the "compulsion to renounce love," on the supposition that it is the end of all things it may be said

* "Fort in des Lenzes lachendes Haus: dort schützt dich Nothung das Schwert, wenn Siegmund dir liebend erlag"—translated by Mr Forman, "Speed to the laughing house of the Spring, where saves thee Nothung the sword, since Siegmund to love thee has lived"; by A. Ernst, "Viens au palais riant du printemps, gardée par Nothung l'épée, pour Siegmund qu'amour a vaincu"; by Mr Jameson, "Forth to the laughing house of Spring: there guards thee Nothung the sword, when Siegmund lies captive to love." Not one of these renderings conveys the sense of the last line, "wenn Siegmund dir liebend erlag," which to my mind is obviously, "though Siegmund should die for his love"; the French and second English version turn Siegmund to a Tannhäuser in the Venusberg.

to deprive a man of hate and every other emotion with just as much truth as of love; and in act ii Siegmund refuses to renounce his love even when Death's messenger stands face to face with him! —Lastly, that curse of Alberich's: what *has* it to do with the case? If it is *that* which "breaks the treacherous sword," why do we not hear it in act ii when the sword is literally, as well as musically, broken by Wotan's spear? And why do we not hear it here, if Alberich's curse is really "weighing on this guilt-stained love"? I must confess that I am utterly puzzled by this mysterious dictum. Alberich's curse, as generally understood, is that invoked on all the holders of the Ring at the beginning of scene 4 in *Rheingold;* when Wagner intended that curse to be playing a rôle, he took very good care to sound it, and its sound is perfectly unmistakable: not once does it occur in course of all this act. Surely it cannot be that the esteemed commentator would have us seriously connect the "Nothung" and "Sword" motives with that of the Curse because all three have one descending octave interval in common, paying no regard to the rest of their components; much as if one were to identify the words "connect" and "condemn" because of their first syllable! He might contend, however, that Alberich had cursed Love itself when he robbed the gold, and again when, ere being robbed himself, he threatened that all should be forced to forsake love. Yet on the one hand we are here presented with neither of those derivatives from our melody, but with practically the entire original itself; on the other, Siegmund's sword-winning is no more an "ideal parallel" to Alberich's theft than white is to black: it is its absolute antithesis. In old-fashioned Opera it was a common practice to give hero and villain precisely the same musical phrase to sing, in concerted pieces, but with words of directly opposite intent: may not Wagner have taken a hint from this custom, when he gave Woglinde, Siegmund and Brynhild, the same theme to sing for once in three such diverse situations of his drama? The *contrast* would thus be intentional. At least that explanation saves us from battering our poor heads against all sorts of far-fetched theories. A long-spun melody is not of itself a 'motive,' though its separate constituents may be used thereas, the distinction being somewhat that between a sentence and its component words or notions.

Before quitting the subject, I must apologise to Freiherr von Wolzogen for having drawn attention to one of the very few blunders

in his useful booklet; but when a work has become a standard *vade mecum*, one cannot afford to pass its errors so lightly as those of a mere ephemeral product, especially when one finds them annexed without a blush by English-speaking plagiarists who do not even know the difference between an oak-tree and an ash. Very good pioneer work it is,* a tour de force if one remembers that it was written *before* the first Bayreuth Festival, and the greater part of it in haste; but it makes no pretence of being final or conclusive. Such an interpretation, however objectively conceived, must always be more or less tinged by the expounder's individuality, and the titles selected for the various motives can never be quite adequate representatives of the ideas in the poet-composer's own mind. In the preface to his *Parsifal* "Leitfaden" (1881) Wolzogen himself observes concerning these "distinctive names" that the task of selecting them "is often difficult, and will never entirely succeed; for the musical soul of a motive is just

---

* The first pioneer was Gottlieb Federlein, who sent from America to the *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* of 1871-2 a serial analysis of the *Rheingold* and *Walküre* music. This is gracefully acknowledged by Wolzogen, not only in the preface to the 1876 edition of his *Ring* "Leitfaden" (since entitled "Führer" —*Anglice* "Guide": the amusing broken-English edition omits alike preface and envoi), but also in his comprehensive article on "Leitmotive" in the *Bayr. Bl.* of 1897. From the latter we learn that it was the disappointment of his hopes of Federlein's continuing the research, that led Wolzogen himself to pursue it, at first for his private delectation, with the Prelude to *Siegfried* in the autumn of 1874: "This little study, afterwards published in the 'Mus. Wochenblatt,' had pleased Franz Liszt, and at the preliminary Bayreuth rehearsals of 1875 he encouraged me to continue the labour. Then, while instalments of my detailed explication of the motive-life in 'Siegfried' were still coming out in the 'Mus. Wochenblatt' of 1876, the Leipzig publisher Hr Edwin Schloemp invited me to interpret the whole of the 'Ring' from this view-point, but in briefer fashion, and thus supply a kind of primer ('*Leitfaden*') for the first Festival-guests, the majority of whom were very little prepared as yet. As this had to be done in hot haste, I was glad to be allowed to supplement it by a more exhaustive discussion of 'Siegfried,' and later still of 'Götterdämmerung,' 1878-9, in the 'Mus. Wochenblatt'" (not incorporated with the "Leitfaden," however). From this article we further learn that, among a few other names, those of the "Renunciation, Sword, Flight, and Slumber, motives" were borrowed by the author from Federlein—i.e. from an analyst who probably had not yet seen the *Siegfried* pfte score (pubd 1871), and certainly not that of *Gtdg* (pubd 1875); whilst Wolzogen himself must have chosen most of his additional "names" without the advantage of consulting the orchestral score (*S.* and *G.* both published rather late in 1876).

what cannot be embraced in abstractions. Thus my names are only meant to rank as *tokens;* others might choose other names instead, and perhaps might have often found better ones. But one cannot altogether dispense with such christenings if one wants to speak of motives at all, and when those motives are not restricted to the mere couple of a symphonic movement, denotable by cyphers."

Still more noteworthy are the same author's remarks in his *Tristan* "Leitfaden" (1880), "The creative musician knew nothing of all these designations," and finally in the *Bayr. Blätter* of 1897: "Richard Wagner constantly averred that he regarded the value of this kind of work as residing in its observation of the *poetic* element. . . . But I had the impression as if Wagner the musician, or the musician in Wagner, really viewed the labours of his adherents who sifted the 'Leitmotive' out of his music, and clothed them with names from the poem for better recognition, as something personally foreign to him; as something at which he might look-on with interest and ready commendation, as the work of others, without being able to recognise a mirroring of *his* most intimate creation in this explanatory re-weaving of melodic phrases into a hundred abstract definitions, of which he certainly had never thought. And he was right! For at the moment when his creation rang as music in him, it was a wholly unreflective *musical* tongue, immediate and instinctive, a natural speech in emotional-expressions, 'moments of feeling,' melodic forms, each of which possessed artistic truth and meaning only at its proper place within the whole."

From a personal friend of Wagner's and the widest-known of his expounders, that is a confession to be laid to heart, particularly by those who seek to trip the master with some skipping-rope of his disciples' making, or to ridicule the whole "motive" system because the current but unauthorised tab for a certain theme makes nonsense of some node in the drama. On the other hand, it should be a warning to the simple-minded student not to sit open-mouthed at the feet of *any* interpreter: an open mind, even a healthy spirit of contradiction, is far better. The 'motive-book,' no matter who the author, is like fire, a very good servant, but a dangerous master. And the fatal mistake, committed from the very beginning (not at *Wagner's* instigation), is that of offering these guides to the "unprepared public." The original and

avowed idea, in doing so a quarter of a century since, was to break down the Chinese wall of prejudice erected by those backward critics who dubbed the master's music "void of form." Very good: but that wall has been demolished years ago, and—these "primers" have erected a barbed-wire entanglement in its place; for they have fostered the notion that, to enjoy a Wagner-performance, one must first go through a course of mental drill. How many unfortunates have I seen in this dismal stage of "preparation" for a Bayreuth festival; poor souls whom a super-friend had taken wicked pity on, and was coaching to remember the labels of certain groups of sounds! After a few preliminary lessons, the victims would be put through their paces: a "motive" was struck on the keyboard, and they were expected to fish up its orthodox name from the depths of their bemuddled memories. That was in private; but the process has been pretty faithfully copied in public, sometimes with the addition—dare I breathe it?—of dissolving-views. Everything possible was done to *prevent* the "naïve hearer" from approaching the actual representation in an *un*-prejudiced frame of mind; and the natural result has been that nine tenths of his time in the Bayreuth theatre were spent in the endeavour to translate into terms of the pianoforte—his vehicle of instruction—the strange combinations he for the first time heard in their native tint. Even were the motives always named with approximate suggestiveness, what pleasure could be left for him when he had bemused himself with details long before he knew the whole? But imagine the poor wretch's confusion, his sense of something having gone wrong with the works, when he heard what his teacher had called the "Renunciation-motive," for instance, sounded at Erda's complaint that her sleep had been disturbed!

Two experiences stand sharp in my memory:—In the early years of *Parsifal* a young musical friend had been taken to Bayreuth at an instant's notice, without the smallest fear of "preparation." His only equipment for the ordeal was Nature's gift of a quick ear; yet, after two performances he had found out all the leading themes, and already associated them with quite serviceable notions for his own consumption.—The other side: In 1901, wandering up and down a corridor-train on the way from Cologne to Frankfort, I came across a large 'personally-conducted' party of Anglo-Saxons of uncertain age; each pair of

eyes, male or female (mostly female), was bent on the study of a popular guide-book to the RING, neglecting what of natural charm the factory-chimneys have spared to the banks of the Rhine; and I saw the young 'personal conductor' (who doubtless knew everything, from the pyramid of Cheops to the geysers of the Yellowstone) implored at least once to throw light on some mythical problem. There could be no doubt at all about it when I met the flock again between the acts at Bayreuth, and observed the badged and badgered shepherd's wan expression. Murderous thoughts occurred to me, with the horrible reflection that nowadays one might walk into a travelling agency and get primed for an "understanding" of Wagner.—Honestly, I believe that among each year's newcomers to Bayreuth it is only the despised "fashionable world" that, refusing to be bothered with preparatory courses, comes free of the uniform fixed ideas.

My own advice is: let no one rack his head with interpretations, whether of Wagner's music or his poem, until *after* he has seen the actual drama on the stage, and preferably three or four times. If he is not well up in the German language, he may need a general outline of the plot; but it should be simple and matter-of-fact, absolutely free from sententiousness, from all attempt to preach a moral or trot out inner meanings. Thus he will at least have a chance of forming an independent judgment, instead of being ruled for ever by the rod of others; he will be enabled to let himself tranquilly 'go,' as the music and action draw him resistless into their stream. Afterwards he may wish to refresh and sift his recollections, discover the reason for details whose recurrence may have struck him without his being able quite to class them at the time; *then* the 'motive-book' and the 'interpretation' may stand him in good stead—provided always that he declines pointblank to be bound by the explanations or opinions of the learned or unlearned author (including myself), but determines to "prove all things" on his own account.

The composition of act i *Die Walküre* was completed, according to the dated 'sketch,' Sept. 1, 1854; in none too cheering circumstances. July we saw the composer suffering from an acute development of those money-troubles which had hung like a mill-stone round his neck since the commencement of his Ring-music in the winter 1853-4, and Carl Ritter apparently

assisting him by an advance of that family's annual subvention. Were that the actual arrangement, the temporary relief would soon be exhausted, whilst the approach of another quarter-day, with *no* instalment coming in, would once more grow alarming. Hans von Bülow, who had not heard from his friend Carl for some weeks, writes Carl's brother Alexander toward the middle of August '54: "I have poor news from Zurich. HE is much worried, and gloomy enough to shoot himself. HE must be in very serious outward circumstances—Liszt spoke to me of promissory notes (*Wechseln*). Do stir a bit to get HIM helped —perhaps through Johanna—were it only for the moment." Alexander being on the eve of marriage to Johanna Wagner's sister Francisca, we may be sure that the idea was broached to her: but Johanna had father Albert to keep watch on her hoard, and none of it leaked Richard's way; *they* did not think of their uncle and brother in capitals of any sort, not even in the weeest diamond type. Sept. 9 good Hans is still full of his hero's harass, for he writes R. Pohl: "I could tell you about Wagner—, but it's better for you to learn it by word of mouth," the same letter observing that Johanna had come over to Dresden for her sister's wedding at Pillnitz on the 12th, and had just spent a musical evening at his mother's; a piece of information linking up with the next, namely to Liszt the 19th: "Wagner is in a terrible situation! I have moved Hamburg—in vain [the Albert household; *vid.* 459 *inf.*]. I still have hope that his niece may lend him, not a plank—but a reed of salvation. He had counted on Hülsen—*without* Hülsen!" Poor boy, with his clinging to such straws of hope, and sublime ignorance that his last sentence touched a raw place. Thus he writes Liszt again the 26th: "The sad news about Wagner's situation will be as well known to yourself as to me—and unfortunately there is nothing save the representation of 'Tannhäuser' at Berlin that could extricate him from his embarrassment." On that point we have already had Liszt's curt answer (334 *ant.*); it is followed by comments on a scheme I must first set forth in Wagner's words:—

"Zurich, 16. Sept. 54.—Do you know how I ought to set to work to get up concerts at Brussels, and perhaps two towns in Holland, immediately—as last year at Zurich? Do you think a trip there would earn me 10,000 fr. net? Could you arrange for my being met half-way on their part, and for my programmes

being translated into French and Dutch? If you are able to answer me favourably, I would beg you to open the thing up as speedily as possible: I must earn that sum without delay.—Not a theatre has given me orders: nothing stirs; I seem entirely forgotten!—If I could return from Belgium and Holland with money in my pocket, I should probably be able to resume my work. For the moment all music is laid on one side.—Your medallion is very fine: hearty thanks!—Else I have thoughts for nothing: which has its grounds.—Ever loyally thy Richard."

With the second act of *Walküre* accordingly (begun Sept. 4) a pause occurred; yet that pause can scarcely have been equivalent to total cessation of work, since the last page of the *Rheingold* fair-copy bears its author's inscription "26. Sept. 54."

It is easy to divine what put Belgium and Holland into Wagner's head just now. In Paris the expenses of orchestral and choral concert-giving have always been ruinous, so that an expedition thitherward was not to be dreamt of; but Liszt, as his friend was aware, had quite recently had opportunity of forming an estimate of musical conditions in the Low Countries. With some right, moreover, might Wagner claim assistance in this matter; for Liszt has lately proved the obstacle to income from Berlin (cap. VII.). Which brings us back to that letter of Sept. 30 to Bülow, where Liszt thus follows up his *Tannhäuser* self-exculpation:—"Wagner's latest idea is to give concerts in Holland and Belgium, there to pick up the 10,000 francs he needs. I shall write him this evening, to try and turn him from it. If he attempts to realise it in spite of that, there is great probability that he will hardly cover the expenses of his journey, and will gravely compromise (*aventurera d'une manière fâcheuse*) his high renown, the strong point whereof consists at present in his outward immobility until permitted to return to Germany. There is one métier more triste and barren than that of the virtuoso concert-*giver*—it is the métier of the composer travelling to make known his works to a public that doesn't care a pin about them [!]—in Belgium and Holland in particular. Not only will Wagner encounter opposition in those countries, but he will reunite the various oppositions in a coalition against him. The night of his arrival at Brussels F[étis] and S. will embrace, and he will have great difficulty in obtaining even the half of the bandsmen and singers he needs for his concerts. He has only to ask Berlioz

the sum his Brussels concerts brought him in, to be edified upon this subject—and as for Holland, I lately passed ten days there, sufficient to make me dissuade Wagner from his project.—À propos, why do you not tell me that *Rheingold* is finished and you have the score? Talk to me about it in your next."

Bülow cannot have received the last part of the *Rheingold* fair-copy any earlier, if not a day or two later, than that letter itself, for this is what he replies to Liszt Oct. 6: "In sending me the last portion of his 'Rheingold' score, only a few days since . . [*re* its caligraphy, *vid.* 233 *ant.*] . . Wagner charged me to let you have the entire work without too much delay. Time fails me either to profit by his permission, and make acquaintance with this last portion of the sublime work, or to execute his order to get the whole score bound together, so that no sheet may go astray.* The copyist Wölfel—whom Wagner will probably want to finish his transcript, executed as far as page 82—has now been told to await your return of the remaining three quarters of the score." Now, there is no need of a special aptitude for 'reading between the lines,' to detect a certain childish jealousy in Liszt's inquiry, as Wagner himself next March tells Fischer, another sufferer from causelessly-wounded feelings: "I want to explain to you about the Rheingold score . . . [221 *ant.*]. So soon as both copy and pfte score should be finished, I meant to share the two out for inspection to one after another of my friends, and can assure you that you would not have been the last of them. But Liszt—like yourself—learnt that his pupil had the score, and shewed himself so jealous that, on sending [B.] the last remainder, I made him despatch the whole to Liszt and stop Wölfel in his copying." Of that jealousy Wagner must have had a hint from some other source, for he writes Liszt the day *before* the latter's inquiry of Bülow: "You will receive in a few days' time from Hans the score of *Rheingold*, which I had been sending him in instalments for the purpose of getting a duplicate made in Dresden. Now that I have lately quite finished the fair copy

* Starting for a long private engagement in the wilds of Posen, Hans has "one foot in the train" as he writes. As yet he had had no opportunity to do more than commence his pfte-vocal version (*W.-L.* no. 183, end of March '55—*cf.* 221 *ant.*), and by the time Liszt does at last return the score to Dresden, Hans is simply slaved to death at Stern's Berlin Conservatoire, Hence the task is subsequently transferred to Klindworth.

[3 days since] I can't bear to think it is not in *your* hands yet; though I was rootedly averse to laying it before you in fractions, since to me the committal of the *whole* into your hands is a special and expressive act. Keep it for a provisional four weeks, to glance through on occasion; then I will beg you to send it back again for the present, to enable the copy to be finished."

Wagner thus deprived himself for a considerable time in prospectu of the use of his own score, as he had nothing but rough "loose sheets" to fall back on, in case the *Walküre* required a reference, till that duplicate should be finished. The more chilled must he have felt by Liszt's crossing letter of Sept. 30, in tardy reply to his concert inquiries of the 16th.* That letter of Liszt's, the 'premonition' I spoke of last chapter (p. 348), has not descended to us; a fact of no little significance. With the skeleton of its contents, as sketched to Hans, there is not very much to find fault, unless it be some lack of faith in the power of his friend's music to move a stranger audience;† but it is

* Meanwhile, to judge by one or two messages contained in Wagner's of the 29th, Princess Carolyne or her daughter must have sent a friendly billet. Probably it was through this channel that he heard of Liszt's pique about *Rheingold*, leading him to alter all his plans for the transcription of its score.

† Liszt must have been curiously misinformed as to Belgium and Holland. Berlioz writes him only three months later (Jan. 1, 1855): "I have a proposal for 3 concerts at Brussels in February, but am not madly in love with the Belgians, and should much prefer less money and to pass a few pleasant hours with yourself and our Weimar friends,"—which hardly looks as if his previous Brussels concerts had been a *monetary* failure. Fétis himself writes Liszt Apr. 1, '55, "I have had Berlioz here, and his *L'Enfance du Christ* had a success"; whilst Lassen had written a month previously, from Rome (he held the 'Prix'), "One of my Brussels friends, Mr Jules Guillaume, a young littérateur of much talent, writes me that he has read your remarkable feuilleton on Wagner in the 'Constitutionnel,' from which he concluded that you were thinking of enthroning Wagner's reputation in France. My friend is one of his sincerest admirers; he has contributed to popularising his [W.'s] name at home ["chez nous"—i.e. at Brussels] in the 'Révue trimestrielle des artistes' and in various other journals. Jules would like to undertake the translating of Wagner's operas. . . . At the moment he occupies the post of editor of 'l'Observateur Belge'; it is he who made the libretto of the opera I am now terminating. He has asked me for an introduction to you," etc. We hear nothing else of the said *Constitutionnel* feuilleton (probably an unauthorised retro-translation by Tyskiewicz, such as Liszt mentions to Brendel Apr. 1, '55); but it is clear that Wagner's Brussels chances were by no means so hopeless as Liszt had hastily assumed, whereas Holland sends an honorary diploma within 3 weeks of Liszt's missing letter (*vid. inf.*).

abundantly plain not only from the opening paragraph of Wagner's answer (no. 165, undated, early October), but also from two or three quotation-marks therein—"public recognition," "successes," "renown"—that the skeleton had been clothed with rather starchy drapery. Something unusually frigid must it have been, to draw from a seeker for business information the opening protest: "But dearest Franz, could you have really believed for a moment that I had contemplated giving concerts for sake of self-propaganda—or making music—or God knows what? Couldn't you understand at once that this idea was a sheer offspring of despair in a vile pecuniary situation; and that the only point to reply on, was as to whether I could make money by it or not, money for an unparalleled sacrifice, for a denial of myself which I should probably have been *unable* to go through with after all?—How badly I must have expressed myself! [nothing could have been clearer]. Pardon me for having given you cause for such a misconception! —Accept the more thanks, however, for all the trouble you took notwithstanding."

Indeed it was a strange position. The same Liszt who five years back had forced him to Paris, almost to London; who in '51 had published the *Lohengrin et Tannhäuser* brochure with "an object which neither you nor your friends have been able to divine" (iii, 217), and in '52 had scattered it broadcast over Paris, yet immediately thereafter declared a Paris production of *Tannhäuser* "not to be thought of at present" (*ibid.* 394); who in July '53 had discountenanced England as a field of operations (150 *ant.*), and in September had "diplomatically" surrendered *Lohengrin* to the Leipzig philistines without conditions; who, after conducting Wagnerian excerpts at the Carlsruhe festival and proposing to direct a Wagner concert in Berlin, had managed the Berlin *Tannhäuser* negotiations with so high a hand that the affair was in a hopeless impasse at this very instant—reproves his friend for the mere semblance of evangelising on his own account! Had Wagner actually been prompted by that motive, it surely was no subject for a sermon; had he been criminal enough to wish to "make his works known," at least they were his own from A to Z. Why should he, whose practical grasp of everything connected with his art was immeasurably greater than his comrade's, be kept under lock like an infant? Great as had been Liszt's services, it was presuming too much on the position

of patron, and it is difficult to believe that there was not some jealousy at work—inspired by the lady supervisor of Liszt's missives?—a jealousy at the thought of the protégé's breaking into the outer world without the Weimar ticket.* For *why*, in heaven's name, should "outward immobility" be "the strong point in Wagner's renown"?

Not a trace of any such suspicion shews itself in Wagner's answer; but mystification it evinces, and with justice. To entrench himself behind his dignity and "fame," will not pay off his debts, and he places the lightest of fingers on Liszt's inconsistency: "How happy and proud I was 3 years ago, when I had done nothing at variance with my whole feeling and clear knowledge of my compulsory attitude towards our artistic Publicity. When your friendly care, even then, already was striving to gain me 'public recognition' and help my works to circulation, how I smiled and warded all temptation off. But the demon seized me: in the terrible dulness of my life I felt an itch for at least some scantling of existence' sweets again; temptation shewed its face, I trafficked in my scores, was surprised by their successes —and—hoped. That hope I curse. So deeply humbled do I feel in my own eyes, that in vain I still am seeking ransom from this agony of self-reproach."

That cry might have melted a glacier, were it not, perhaps, for a subsequent entreaty (in the same letter), the particular application whereof does not transpire:† "Do let us abandon all Policy, this dabbling with means we despise, for the attainment of ends that can never be reached—and least of all by such means. Do let us leave coterie, that alliance with cretins who, take the lot of them together, haven't an inkling of what we are after. I ask you, what satisfaction, what comfort can we gain through aid of all these nincompoops, no matter what their names? At times

* Cf. Liszt's expression of Jan. 1, '55: "The offer of the Philharmonic is quite acceptable, and your friends will be delighted at it"—not "*I* am delighted."

† Herr Glasenapp connects it with Liszt's bait to Dorn, the first mounting of *his* "Nibelungen"; but that was a story nearly a twelvemonth old, and Liszt had been treading on both the Berlin Kapellmeisters' corns of late—to say nothing of Wagner's *asking*, farther down the letter, "Say, how do things stand with Berlin?" (338 *ant.*). The whole tenour of this doubtful passage rather suggests a riposte to some present counsel of Liszt's in the offending letter of Sept. 30.

I fail to understand that ironical bonhomie (*Lebenslust*) which enables you to scoff away your disgust at these people [*cf.* 228 *ant.*].—Away with the stuff: away with 'fame' and all that nonsense: we're not living in an age when Fame can bring joy or give honour!"—Directly followed as it is by a long paragraph about *Tannhäuser* and *Lohengrin* having now become mere bread-winners,* this home-thrust clearly shews the kind of sermon Liszt had preached him: namely that he must not lower himself (by self-advertisement?) in the eyes of certain superior Dick, Tom and Harry's. A fine preachment, indeed, to the most uncompromising of all great artists! It is not difficult, however, to divine its origin: the passivity inculcated on Wagner by Carolyszt is the necessary pendant to Liszt's unbending attitude toward Hülsen—the two ideas are linked in Liszt's letter to Hans of the selfsame day, which we may safely take as groundwork of that which Wagner now is answering.

Yet Wagner does not leave his friend with an expostulation droning in the ear. Worked up though he be to a fervour of impassioned self-defence, he devotes the last two pages of an unusually long letter to the warmest panegyric on "Liszt's" latest published effort (255 *ant.*), ending: "What the others write, I

---

* Quoted p. 338 *ant.*—Within a week or so, though then in the heart of *Die Walküre*, Wagner addressed a Breslau correspondent in terms that prove his lasting fondness for these earlier works. *Lohengrin* was under rehearsal by the enthusiastic Seydelmann (iii, 390-1) for production in that city Oct. 31, and a critic on the staff of the local *Oderzeitung* had privately conveyed to the composer his admiration for the work, which, despite the cackling of "the ignorant," was "certain of the verdict of the connoisseur." Wagner closes a lengthy reply with the observation that, in presenting an artwork to the public, it is *not* that "Urtheil des Kenners" he cares for, but the effect on intuitive instinct—*Anschauung:* "Should the coming representation afford that intuition, as I hope, my only other wish would be, that I may not have deceived myself in the subject when I cherished its image with resistless affection. May its artistic effigy *so* captivate you now, as that wondrous story once compelled myself beyond a choice, nay, almost past all fathoming, to make it mine in doleful-blissful inspiration. May you then inquire the metaphysical ground of that captivation as little as I did in its execution, but leave to the Miraculous its unabated right to fill us with its wistful joys and griefs amid a world of dreariest practical reason." To the various 'interpreters,' who are so fond of claiming the master's example and authority, I commend this additional warning against "metaphysical ground"-grubbing, on the one hand, and logical straw-splitting on the other.

can read no more. I now read nothing but your Dutchman-essay: that is the guerdon—the pride of my life!"

The Low Countries concert-scheme—the necessity whereof we soon shall find to have ceased to exist—has vanished into smoke, and Wagner naturally would consider the incident closed. But that smoke gathers to a cloud on the Weimar horizon, from which is launched the thunderbolt that disturbed us toward the end of last chapter. An announcement of the greatest interest to a bosom-friend has Wagner made in this letter 165, "I am in the second act of the *Walküre*, Wodan and Fricka; so, you see, I'm getting on"; an announcement, and three questions that date it almost to a day (Oct. 4?): 1° "How do things stand with Berlin?" 2° "Have you received *Rheingold* yet?" 3° "Are you writing my wife?" i.e. to Leipzig about the chance of a *Lohengrin* performance on her way home through Weimar. Some kind of answer was imperatively demanded, and must surely have been given on the last point at least, or Wagner would not have written G. Schmidt on the 17th that it now seemed unlikely that Minna would hear *Lohengrin* anywhere (339 *ant.*). That answer must have been our "thunderbolt," the demolisher of all epistolary communion between these friends for the next two months, the key to Wagner's great solicitude concerning Liszt's "susceptibilities." I do not wish to imply that our hero was altogether free from blame, since that remark of his about "coterie and alliance with cretins" was a stiff outspokenness even for the closest of friends to stomach; but coming with the high laudation of "Liszt's" *Dutchman* essay and the flattering unction "You shall have my [new] scores; they shall belong to *us*, and to nobody else," it should either have been swallowed with a good-tempered smile, or rejected with a good sound oath. The actual nature of the thunderbolt I should rather deduce from an earlier expression of Wagner's, "Can you really feel too superior (*vornehm*) toward me?" (229 *ant.*). Certainly, Minna was hospitably entertained to performances of two of her husband's operas, after all; but the Berlin matter froze to ice, as we have seen; and the *Rheingold*—well, that we all must wait for.

In such circumstances it needed in truth a great liberation, to restore the composer to any heart for the music of his *Walküre*.

Luckily that liberation was effected in two different directions, an inner and an outer, at this very epoch. The inner I will merely indicate, for the present, by the closing passage of a little-known letter to Bülow, Oct. 26:* "My life has gone to the dogs; whence I am to draw incitement to music-making, I comprehend less and less. A great boon has come to me, however, through acquaintance with the works of the great philosopher *Schopenhauer* (deliberately ignored for 35 years by the Professors). You must procure his principal work at once, '*Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*,' Leipzig, Brockhaus; then 'Parerga und Paralipomena,' Berlin, A. W. Hayn. You will be amazed, when you learn to know this brain." From that time forth—or rather, from let us say a fortnight earlier, about the beginning of the music for Wotan's monologue—the works of the Sage of Frankfort tinge the whole of Wagner's cogitations. As he tells Liszt, some two months later, on announcing to *him* the discovery: "His chief idea, the final abnegation of the Will-to-live, is of terrible seriousness, yet alone-redeeming. To me it naturally came as nothing new; and no one, for that

* The date is derived by the *Bayr. Bl.* (where it first was published, 1900) from that of the Zurich postmark; this is confirmed by the remainder of the contents, to which I shall return (Appendix) as they are of considerable æsthetic interest.—For those who relish 'unfavourable sources' I supply an account from the *Gegenwart* article already adduced (77 and 152 *ant.*): "It was on Herwegh's writing-table that Wagner once found 'Parerga und Paralipomena,' which had just appeared; upon opening the book he burst into loud laughter. He had dropped plump on the wicked chapter about the ladies. 'The man must have known Minna,' he cried; read on and on; and, hurrying home terribly late, ordered at Meyer & Zeller's bookshop everything of Schopenhauer's that had been published. Thenceforth this philosopher became his hobby-horse, and to such a violent degree that he put his best friends to flight with his wild interpretations. Particularly Herwegh, who likewise was a politician in philosophy, and therefore preferred Feuerbach." The Devil's Advocate has a very poor brief: even the comically-worded assertion as to Herwegh's preference is refuted by the fact that he was one of the promoters of the invitation to Schopenhauer to transfer himself to Zurich (declined with thanks); the implied date of issue of the *Parerga* is 3 years too late, or that of Wagner's acquaintance therewith 3 years too early; the insinuation as to Wagner's hurrying home (while shops were still open) for fear of a scolding, would be grotesque even if Minna had not been away on her holiday then—unfortunately for Frau Herwegh's mouthpiece; and we may therefore dismiss the alleged exclamation as of a piece with the rest of this scandal-mongering "source."

matter, can grasp the thought, into whose life it has not already entered. But this philosopher has been the first to waken it in me to such clearness." There we must leave the inner liberation till a more convenient season.

The outer almost coincided with the inner, in point of time. September 14, two days before that letter in which he broached to Liszt the abortive notion of figuring as a peripatetic concert-giver, Wagner had written friend Sulzer in Zurich a circumstantial account of his pecuniary plight, thus summarised by Steiner (*Neujahrsblatt* 1902):—The German theatres, which usually arrange for their winter novelties in August and September, have left him in the lurch; a serious competitor has further arisen in the shape of Meyerbeer's new opera (*L'Etoile du Nord*). How, then, is Wagner to escape from his embarrassments? He declares himself ready to part with all his belongings, though that would mean his leaving Zurich: "Dear as Zurich has become to me, especially through the friends I have gained here, I am prepared to expiate my imprudence by going away—with grief and bitterness? that must be my own look-out. Only my wife would be unable to bear such a removal; indeed I fear 'twould be her death.—Wherefore I must do all possible to avert that risk.— —Now, dear friend, do try and find a way to help me to avoid the necessity of a very bad catastrophe—particularly with regard to my wife. From Germany, in spite of certain vague prospects opened to me there, I can expect nothing just now; whatever help there is for me, can spring from none but such friendly relations as one nowhere meets, in the circumstances, except in one's nearest neighbourhood." The sum he needs to cover his obligations (probably, also, to leave something in hand for the future) is that 10,000 francs mentioned to Liszt; whereas he reckons that his works are bound to bring him in about its double within the next three or four years. So he asks Sulzer to effect a "combination" by which that 10,000 f. shall be advanced him on his operatic performing-rights—another plan already proposed through Liszt to Leipzig—with Sulzer to act as what he will presently call his "trustee" (*Vormund*).

That this plan was soon carried out, "with Wesendonck's assistance," we learn from Steiner, who rightly claims the gratitude of posterity for "men who removed the outward hindrances on the master's road at a most important epoch in

his creative labours. How many to-day would wish to have stood in Sulzer's or Wesendonck's shoes, albeit that is not to say they would have done the same under like conditions!" By all means. Yet Zurich must not arrogate to itself the credit for the good action of two of its inhabitants, one of whom, a semi-Americanised Rhinelander, it drove from its gates some 17 years after. It was the individual, again, not the mass; and to have been the lifelong friend of two such individuals as Wesendonk and Sulzer is in itself a credential of character.

Precisely what the financial arrangement was, we are not informed. Presumably Sulzer received a verbal undertaking from Wagner that, beyond a sufficient amount to keep things going, future receipts from the theatres would be paid over to him (S.) in trust for himself and Wesendonk, until the debt should be wiped out. At anyrate we find Wagner giving instructions next April for payment to Sulzer of the £80 advance on his Berlin royalties (356 *ant.*), whilst the same friend is informed a month later that there will be about £40 savings to bring (him?) back from London. Here also would be sunk the greater part of the twelvemonth's fairly handsome takings from Berlin two years hence. But, that the debt toward Sulzer was ever entirely discharged, judging by a letter of Dec. '58, I think improbable; toward Wesendonk it certainly mounted still higher in the long run. Neither of them regarded the present or any future transaction as a mere matter of business, but almost purely as a friendly act; nor would a word about it have ever drifted into print, had not the heirs felt justly incensed at the tone adopted in some quarters (*not* Wahnfried) in regard of these most noble benefactors. Just as to the Ritter family we virtually owe the poem of the RING, so to Jakob Sulzer and Otto Wesendonk, beyond that family, we owe the major portion of its music.

This friendly compact must have been completed by the middle of October, since Wagner jokingly writes Wesendonk the 21st: "We have been named Honorary Member of the Netherlands Music-society [Hague]. Our first laurel-wreath won in common I beg you will hang up in your counting-house: the sight of it will fortify you too to courage and endurance, just as it already has lifted me high!"—an allusion the exact point whereof is first made clear by the above, though we previously knew that the said society had honoured itself by conferring its diploma on

Richard Wagner, among a round dozen of composers. The joke, however, is no sign of a light heart, as may be seen in its context and the letter to Hans of five days later. "Courage and endurance" were all that the most generous efforts of Zurich friends could give him, while Liszt was sulking in his tent. And so the music for acts ii and iii of *Walküre* is written in a mood in perfect harmony with the reflections of Wotan and Schopenhauer.

Though we now learn (*cf* 300-*ant.*) that the 'composition-draft' of act ii is dated "4. September 1854—18. November 1854," we have seen it laid aside for the greater part of September (390 *ant.*), whilst early October shewed the Wotan-Fricka scene in progress. Years hence (Aug. '68) Wagner writes his prospective first "Wotan," Franz Betz: "To make yourself thoroughly at home in the rôle, commence by studying the third act of the Walküre: the enormous difficulty resides in the second act, with which, in my opinion, you should familiarise yourself at first by blank recital—notwithstanding that a declaiming of it without the aid of musical modulation, as by an actor, is altogether inconceivable. For that matter, a good exercise in style is afforded by the Rheingold, namely in respect of proper rhythmic musical inflection (*Redeflexion*)." No one having yet proved a safer critic of his works than this composer himself, we may take his comparison between these various Wotan scenes as a reliable guide: from *Das Rheingold* to act ii of *Die Walküre* the advance in "musical modulation" of what *Op. & Drama* called "verse-melody" is marked; not a bar of commonplace remains, yet the whole declamation is at once musical and natural, not only in Wotan's part, but in all the four contrasting others; whilst the "enormous difficulty" lies not in the notes, but in the intellectual grasp required of a performer who should worthily reproduce the emotions words and notes express.

A twelvemonth after composition of this act, sending Liszt its finished score Oct. '55, the musician writes: "I am concerned about [your probable opinion of] the momentous second act: it contains two such weighty catastrophes as to afford matter enough for a pair of acts; yet both so depend on one another, and the one draws the other so immediately after it, that a separation here was clean impossible. Reproduced exactly as I demand, how-

ever,—with complete understanding of every intention—it is bound to effect a catharsis (*Erschütterung*) the like whereof has never been. Such a thing, of course, was written for none but those who can sustain something (in other words, for nobody!): that incapables and weaklings will cry out, can in nowise move me. You must decide for yourself whether everything has turned out well—according to my intentions too; for my part, I can't alter it. In dull faint-hearted hours I had most fear of Wodan's great scene, especially of the disclosure of his fate to Brünnhilde; eh, in London [scoring it] I had already got the length of wanting to throw the scene quite over: to decide the question, I took the whole draft in hand again, and sang the scene through to myself with all needful expression; which luckily convinced me that my *spleen* was unwarranted, and on the contrary, that a fit delivery made it engrossing even as pure music. That rendering I have indicated more precisely in some places; yet much still remains, and it will be a principal task of mine some day, to induct a talented singer and impersonator into the very heart of my intentions by living communication. You—as I confidently hope—will discover the right [mood] at once. It is the weightiest scene for the march of the whole four-membered drama, and as such will probably soon find due sympathy and heed."

Liszt's opinion of this act is not on record; but, judging by his subsequent objection to a kindred scene in act iii, he is more likely to have shared the composer's prior fears than his ultimate confidence. Indeed, for twenty years after the first Bayreuth production, act ii of *Die Walküre* was a thorn in the side of the critics, until there arose a performer endowed by nature with the mental gifts required for grappling with this greatest of all Wagnerian tasks. It is not altogether surprising, then, that so sympathetic an analyst as Maurice Kufferath, while acknowledging the beauties of music and text *per se*, should in '87 have come to the conclusion that "Wagner's fine sense did not deceive him when doubts assailed him in London on this subject" (*La Walkyrie*, Fischbacher, Paris, p. 116). Kufferath's alternative proposal, however, is itself full vindication of the dramatist's deliberate choice: "Would it not have been possible, perhaps, to gather into a scene *à trois* the twofold struggle, internal and external, which Wagner presents to us successively and in separation? Brunnhilde, of course, could not have been allowed to hear the whole of Fricka's

reproaches to Wotan; but all that Wotan reveals to Brunnhilde, she might have been let learn, either indirectly or directly, during the quarrel; and in that way the conclusion of the preceding scene would have merged into the conclusion of this scene with Brunnhilde." Imagine it: husband and wife hurling double-meanings at each other, out of respect for step-daughter's modesty; papa and step-mamma going off in a huff, in opposite directions, leaving Miss to clear away the broken crockery! More seriously, an operatic trio. As if the strength of this whole act ii, as of the latter halves of the other two acts in *Die Walküre*, did not consist in that very "temerity" which Kufferath deplores, to wit the planning of its every scene for no more than "two personages."* With Wagner that is the tragic rule, outside *Das Rheingold*; wherever it is departed from perforce, the effect is in so far weakened. To my mind, there are few proofs so plain of his skill in dramatic construction, as the manner in which he first introduces us to his warrior-maid in a scene just long enough to shew her fighting spirit and opposition to the goddess of Order, then sets her free till her returning shout precipitates the issue. It is quite unthinkable that Fricka should have pursued her plea with any dignity in presence of a third party, and of a third party whose very origin was a rock of offence to her.

At the root of M. Kufferath's suggestion lies his remark about that Wotan-Fricka scene itself: "From the theatrical, the scenic point of view, this long dispute is perhaps a weakness in the work. It is certain that it interests the spectator little, and seems to make the action halt" (*ibid.* 100). That is only explicable by the spectator having nowhere then (outside Bayreuth 1876) been given this scene intact: lopped, as I myself have seen it even at Munich in the eighties, it loses organic vitality, and thus the part seems longer than the whole; one is not allowed time to warm up to it, ere it is dragged away. "Initiation is indispensable, because throughout this second act the drama is entirely interior, so to speak. There is not absence of action, as some have said and written; action exists, but it is essentially psychologic; con-

* In the Siegmund-Brynhild scene Sieglinde, sleeping, does not count except as a piece of still life.—Naturally I am not belittling the chorus of Valkyries; in fact their pleading with Wotan constitutes one of the most beautiful episodes in the music of the RING; but, to all intents, they here speak as one entity.

sequently it cannot manifest itself except through a small number of immediately seizable words and gestures, which do not suffice to explain everything to the general run of spectators" (*ibid.* 107). The old, old cry for 'initiation' or 'interpretation,' which itself has scared more people back from Wagner's works than any adverse criticism. The sole interpretation needed for a drama is that by the performers; but *that* must be intelligent, and above all, one must be able to hear and understand what they are saying. *Hamlet* also would "seem to halt," were one in no position to follow its words; which perhaps may account for Kufferath's dictum that "Shakespeare is sublime and unplayable" (*ibid.* 115). When the RING was resurrected at Bayreuth in 1896, this scene between Wotan and Fricka made almost the deepest impression, upon many of us, of anything in the *Walküre;* because it had two exponents who had been thoroughly imbued with the dramatic "intentions" of their rôles. Who will ever forget the imperial majesty of Marie Brema * as the goddess upholding the honour of her high estate? For the first time we realised what the author had intended, what the notes of his score might have taught, namely that this Fricka is no ranting, raving tragedy-queen, but the supreme representative of that ceremonial "beauty" by which these gods had won dominion over a world till then in chaos ("Die ihr durch Schönheit herrscht, schimmernd hehres Geschlecht," *Rh.* 25). For Fricka in olden times had Wotan pledged one of his eyes, so priceless in them did her possession then seem; even a husband's cold neglect could never have converted this embodiment of shapely peace into a mere scolding shrew. Her music, as said, might have told us that; music the proud charm whereof is scarce ruffled at height of her just indignation. Here, again, is a great advance on the similar scene in *Rheingold*, an advance in the marriage of haunting musical inflections to the finest shades of the text: few if any pages of the RING music surpass these in subtle variety of expression, culminating in that positively classic *arioso* "Deiner ew'gen Gattin heilige Ehre beschirme heut' ihr Schild!" One feels that Wotan is conquered by no fear of his wife, but by recollection of his former worship of her: she has well-nigh conquered ourselves, thrown our sympathy with Siegmund and Sieglinde into the shade for the nonce—provided we shut our ears

* Frau Reuss-Belce also; but that came a little later.

to doctrinaires of all kinds. And that is surely the impression the poet-musician meant us to receive: with each of his characters, true dramatist that he is, he stands in fullest sympathy while they occupy the stage. As Fricka makes her exit in sublime composure, with that haughty permit to the illegitimate to approach her father (almost in the same mould as Elsa's invitation to Ortrud), we know that at the burning of Walhall the most unflinching of its victims will be this goddess now prepared to face the consequences of what her reason tells her to be right; not a muscle in her glorious frame will quiver, not a fold of her immaculate drapery be disarrayed; a Marie Antoinette proceeding to the scaffold.

This Pyrrhic victory of Fricka's has daunted not only Wotan, but Brynhild. Her wild Valkyrie-shout fell flat on that *arioso*, as a string suddenly loosed from one of its attachments, its resistance dispensed with. Wotan's outburst of despair strikes a chord untouched as yet in her breast, the chord of sympathy with anguish such as the strong man foiled alone can feel; with those beautiful tones, "sieh', Brünnhilde bittet," she already enters the path of transformation from Valkyrie to woman, and one of the most suggestive shadings in all the score ensues. The very tenderness of her accents reminds her father that it is the tender passion that has played havoc with his world-scheme; her vocal phrase is repeated by the bass clarinet, and transmuted into the pair of themes we have heard so frequently associated with Siegmund and Sieglinde's love in act i: their love, unforeseen by God Wotan, has ruined all his careful plan. That at least, is how I read it, right or wrong: it is the beginning of a train of thought which gradually leads up to Wotan's bequeathing of the world, where Love has simply devastated, to the only power that seems to prosper in it, the power of Hate.—No, I must not attempt to analyse this stupendous monologue: let me round it with that other gem of a sighing phrase, "wie waren sie leicht!" as Brynhild, left to her depressing task, contrasts the weight of her armour now with that when her heart itself was light.

For collectors of 'reminiscences'—and it is by no means so childish a hobby as our superior friends would have us think—here is an interesting addition to their scrapbook. The second half of Wotan's monologue, and the ensuing duologue with Brynhild, are accompanied by an agitated musical figure variously known as the

motive of "Götternoth," "Unruhe," "Wotan's Distress," and so on. "Open the score of *Oberon*"—says M. Kufferath—"and you will find this theme almost textually presented, identical in design, similarly harmonised, developed in analogous fashion, and applied to the same order of sentiments; it is the beautiful introduction to the air (no. 2 in the original score) in which Oberon gives vent to his despair. The resemblance is so striking, that one cannot help thinking of an involuntary loan imposed by memory." That is not impossible, though I believe ten years had elapsed since Wagner last heard *Oberon* (Dresden 1844). On the other hand, as Kufferath himself points out, the figure is a derivative from the Erda (*alias* Norns) motive; and that sprang in turn from the Nature (or Ur-element) theme with which *Das Rheingold* opened, and upon which the whole Ring-music may be said to rest. The similiarity to Weber's theme I should rather take as another evidence of that general similarity in musical bent so often remarked between these two great masters. In Wagner the spirit of Weber seems to have reincarnated itself, with added power, intensity and breadth. Thus we shall find in the scoring of this act another sort of tie with Weber:—In the incantation scene of *Freischütz* we have the baying of the hounds of the Wild Hunt depicted by the same quality of chord as lends point to Sieglinde's frenzied hallucination regarding Hunding's pack, both composers using horns and bassoons; but Wagner's dissonance is in a much closer 'position,' and whilst Weber adds trombones, his successor's keen ear excludes them in favour of trumpets—a far more realistic timbre. There can be very little doubt that he deliberately annexed the effect, to improve on it; and why should he not? As the man-hunt develops in fury, Weber's one chord and one combination are left miles behind; wind-instrument after wind-instrument is slipped on the track of those horns, till the very flutes have seized the cry—but never the solemn trombones.*

An old proverb tells us that one man may steal a horse, while

* The trumpets accent only the beginning of the hue and cry, as they are required for the Sword-motive. It should be noted that during the counterpart of this passage, after Brünnhilde's exit, Hunding's actual pursuit, the Sword-motive has a continuation sung by Siegmund to the words "Nothung zahl' ihm den Zoll" which anticipates the Wanderer's "schmiedet Nothung neu" (*Siegfried* p. 28) in a similar connection with the Sword-motive immediately after the Fearless-theme mentioned p. 31 *antea*.

another mayn't even look over the gate. It is perfectly true: one man *may;* but all depends on the man. When Napoleon stole the gilt horses from the façade of S. Mark's at Venice, the chief question might be, Did he do it for breeding purposes? Whatever the answer, similar depredations undoubtedly led to a great revival of the plastic arts in France, and the stolen goods were mostly returned in the end to their owners, or original stealers. It is not quite the same thing, to steal from a friend a foal scarcely weaned from its mother: yet that is the story repeated ad nauseam, regarding one of Wagner's subsidiary phrases, by people who can never have condescended to inquire whether such a forced loan were physically possible. Liszt's last secretary-pupil is primarily responsible for this mare's-nest,* which has been sedulously reproduced from his miniature life-sketch in many another quarter: "It was at a rehearsal of the Walküre in the year 1876, which Liszt attended at Bayreuth, when at Sieglinde's dream-words in the second act, 'Kehrte der Vater nun heim?' [*sic*] Richard Wagner suddenly plucked Liszt by the arm, saying, 'Papa, here comes a theme I have from you.' 'Very good'—answered Liszt—'then at least it will be heard by some one!' The theme in question is the beginning of Liszt's 'Faust-symphony,' upon hearing which for the first time at the Tonkünstler convention at Weimar of August 5 to 8, 1861 (when the Allgemeiner deutsche Musikverein was definitely founded), Wagner delightedly exclaimed 'Music has many beautiful and glorious things, but this music is divinely beautiful!'" (August Göllerich's *Liszt*, p. 10, pubd Reclam; without date, but written after Liszt's death).

The two themes undoubtedly have a striking resemblance, as I will ocularly demonstrate; but, did it never occur to any of the retailers of this story that the incident was improbable, on the face of it? Setting aside the fact that Liszt was present at the preliminary rehearsals in 1875 (G.'s last cypher might possibly be a slip), had not the vocal score of *Die Walküre*, quite plainly setting forth the allegedly borrowed theme, been published fully ten years previously, and the Partitur itself quite two? On that count alone, the details of the work, as Wagner must know, could be nothing new to Liszt. There is much more than that,

* For the remainder of the nest's amazing contents see Appendix.

510

however, and much that ought not to have escaped the hastiest student of the Wagner-Liszt letters (freely quoted by Göllerich himself). From these it might have been deduced at a glance that any such remark as the above, if it ever really fell from Wagner's lips, could be nothing but a joke, perhaps a sly allusion to the tattling of earlier mischief-makers, of which we shall hear more next volume. It would have been downright impossible for Wagner to borrow anything for act ii of *Die Walküre* from Liszt's Faust-symphony, since the two works were actually composed at the selfsame time and hundreds of miles apart. July 28, '54, Liszt writes him, "As soon as my arrears of correspondence are disposed of, I shall set to work at my Faust, which ought to be finished by the new year"; Wagner mid-December, "When shall I see your Symphonic poems?—Your Faust?" Liszt, Jan. 1, '55, "I have finished my Faust-symphony * (in 3 movements—Faust—Gretchen—and Mephistopheles)—and will bring it to Zurich next summer"; and Wagner again in March (on the point of *scoring* act ii), "Whenever shall I hear a little of your Faust symphony?" Not till a month or two after the whole *Walküre* score is finished, fair-copy and all, does Wagner see *any* of Liszt's compositions beyond that *Künstler* chorus already mentioned (226 *ant.*); the Faust-symphony he plainly never saw before he heard it at Weimar in 1861, the year of its publication.

No doubt there is an alternative possibility, namely that Liszt borrowed the theme from Wagner. Certainly he had the completed first two acts of *Die Walküre* lent him from early October '55 to early January '56, and again the whole full scores both of *Rheingold* and *Walküre* were in his care for a few months from July '56; whilst he and Wagner went through much of, if not all the vocal score of the work last-named at Zurich together that autumn. Yet the revision of the Faust-symphony in 1857 for its first public performance—when the *Chorus mysticus* at least was added to it—can scarcely have struck at the work's root in such a fashion as to import a totally new theme for its hero himself. That possibility also may therefore be unhesitatingly dismissed.

---

* Liszt to Brendel Aug. 12, '54, "I am working at my *Faust*-symphony now"; to Cossmann Sept. 8, "On your return I shall have nearly finished my Faust symphony, at which I am working as if possessed"; to Anton Rubinstein Oct. 19, "My Faust is finished, and I shall give it to be copied in a couple of days."

Before supplying what I am convinced is the true key to the mystery, let me present the theme; first in Liszt's modelling:

Fräulein Ramann, from whose biography I respectfully borrow the notation,* remarks that "not every kind of chord or discord could have expressed the dissonance on which Faust moves," and that the "tragic element" is embodied in that "sharpened fifth." Possibly it is, but one cannot humbly accept the lady's dictum that "this succession of augmented triads is the first example of its kind in all the tone-works of the ages," "a great harmonic acquisition" needing a special treatise to expound "its modulatory and æsthetic consequences." That is what the vulgar would call a very large order; probably an old Leipzig cantor, certainly a young Bonn sonatist (op. 2. 3) could meet it, however, to say nothing of Liszt's comrade (e.g. a not unknown "Hojotoho!"), with whose works this authoress betrays no great familiarity. But we presently learn that in the main body of the work the Faust-theme is chiefly characterised by an ordinary, not an augmented fifth; which renders it at least arguable that this "tragic element" and the introduction itself (from which the example is taken) were added in that 1857 revision. However that be, it is the unsophisticated fifth that the theme presents in the form which others accuse Wagner of having—to put it bluntly—stolen:



* To do L. Ramann justice, she does not retail her school-assistant's story, though citing his booklet more than once in other connections.

Truly a remarkable likeness. It being certain that Wagner made no alteration in his *Walküre* score after its completion in 1855 (acts i and ii) and 1856 (act iii), and it being most improbable that Liszt should have pulled his whole first movement to pieces to introduce therein a theme of this importance, the conclusion is obvious: consciously or unconsciously, the two friends derived their motive from a common source. Long ago might that source have been laid bare, if Schubert's Sonatas had not fallen rather out of fashion, some of them most undeservedly. Turn to his giant in B flat (no. 10 in Novello's collection): in the working-out section of its first movement you will find nearly two pages built on the appended subject, in almost every conceivable modulation:

That in itself would be very strong presumptive evidence, particularly if we remember that this theme also forms the introduction to the same composer's famous "Wanderer" song. But proceed to the sonata's Trio, and you find its second period beginning thus, the identical notes of Sieglinde's dream-words:



Taking the two together, no room remains for doubt. Liszt's fondness for Schubert's music is notorious; this is one of the sonatas he afterwards re-edited: at Zurich or Paris he *must* have played it in 1853, and thus Wagner might really be said, in a sense, to "have the theme from" him, i.e. from Liszt's fingers. From the end of the expository section of its first movement may even have come that motive Y already-discussed, the resemblance here being still closer than that of the Weber

phrase; a few bars before that, we find in Schubert's composition a possible germ of the first *Tristan* theme; between that and its repetition there lies the prototype of what L. Ramann numbers "theme 3" in Liszt's symphony; and finally, this sonata's first and principal subject, though its 'intervals' are much narrower, most plainly furnishes the backbone for Liszt's grandiose theme 5. These latter points might not be so convincing in themselves perhaps, but, viewed in light of the chief resemblance, they all lend colour to the assumption that echoes from Schubert's great B-flat sonata were lingering in the ears alike of Liszt and Wagner when they simultaneously put their part-owned theme on paper. Wagner, however, makes very little use of it. Beyond the example above-noted, from Sieglinde's dream, with him we find it but once quite unmistakably, namely in act iii, when it hedges in Wotan's "So thatest du, was so gern zu thun ich begehrt" (text 77):



Here, you see, the fifth is augmented in the first bar of each pair, though not in quite the same 'position' as Liszt's. Our third Wagnerian example will shew that augmented fifth in precisely Liszt's position, though the phrase's pattern slightly varies:



Now, this last example is highly instructive. It is from the accompaniment to Fricka's taunt to Wotan, "Doch jetzt, da dir neue Namen gefielen, als 'Wälse' wölfisch im Walde du schweiftest" (*Wlk.* 30), which she vocalises on the same chord as the violins, yet with a rhythm necessarily altered by the diction. Naturally you observe that Fricka and Sieglinde are referring to the selfsame episode; but Fricka for her irony, just as Wotan for his in act iii, is given that boasted "tragic" augmentation of the fifth; whereas Sieglinde's gentle but troubled dream has the same

theme in major and minor triads. For incitation to that tiny discovery alone we may thank the mare's-nesters, notwithstanding that it was the reverse of their intention. Realise that these three brief examples are the only use made of the theme by Wagner,* and you will understand what he meant by speaking of the great *restraint* he placed on himself in his riper works: he refuses to drag in a phrase by the ears for mere sake of its musical beauty. Apart from those 'motives' which occur with sufficient frequency to tempt the commentator to a label, there are scores, I had well-nigh said hundreds, of such characteristic passages awaiting the explorer of *Die Walküre.*

The musical draft of act ii completed Nov. 18, 54, Wagner merely allows himself a Sunday's rest ere commencing that of act iii on the 20th—dates quite recently disclosed to us in Dr Golther's preface to the M. Wesendonk group of letters (*cf* 300-*ant.*). Work at this third act proceeds in silence until that 'Schopenhauer' letter to Liszt, no. 168, which other internal evidence will date about Dec. 12: "For sake of the loveliest of my life-dreams, the young Siegfried, I suppose I must finish the Nibelungen pieces: the Walküre has taken too much out of me, not to treat myself to this refreshment; with that I am now in the second half of the last act. Yet 1856 will be here before I have finished the whole—1858, in the tenth year of my hegira, I may then produce it,—if it is to be. But, as never in my life have I tasted the actual delight of love, to that fairest of all dreams I mean to raise a monument wherein, from beginning to end, that love shall really glut itself for once: I have planned in my head a *Tristan and Isolde*, the simplest but fullest-blooded musical conception; with the 'black flag' that waves at the end, I then shall shroud myself—to die."

Already the great pause, which two to three years hence will interrupt the "loveliest of his life-dreams" for the "fairest of *all* dreams," is plainly forecast: *Tristan* looms on the horizon; born of the sorrows of Siegmund and Sieglinde, the despair of Wotan; born also as an ideal counterpoise to the pessimism of Schopen-

* Unless we may include Wotan's "Wunschmaid war'st du mir" (act iii) and the phrase for 'cellos and basses that precedes Hunding's "Ich weiss ein wildes Geschlecht" (act i). Certainly these also have reference to 'Wotan as father,' a label we may tentatively attach to the theme.

hauer, the optimism of dauntless young Siegfried. The whole combination is symptomatic of the diverse elements now battling in the writer's breast. But the ground-tone is deep melancholy; a melancholy arising largely from the tension of creative work and its attendant eye-strain, but also in part from strained relations with Weimar. "I'm working hard, but—not in a good humour! That, however, has its causes!!"—he hints to dear old Fischer a week later (Dec. 19). Those "causes" he is too loyal to divulge; but large are they writ 'between the lines' of this famous epistle to Liszt: every possible inducement is tried, to tempt a stubborn friend to break his silence and save a heart from breaking. It is the extreme of solemn pathos.

Such the mood in which the composition-draft of *Walküre* was finished. For Liszt leaves even this full olive-branch without acknowledgment till New Year's day, by when he has further received a tiny note: "Brünnhilde sleeps!—I, alas!—still wake!—Today I had an inquiry from the Philharmonic Society of London, whether I should be inclined to conduct their next season's concerts. I have provisionally answered" etc. The London business, a lengthy chapter, must be reserved for next volume; but the date of that "provisional answer" of Wagner's, Dec. 28, supplies the date of this note to Liszt, and thus confirms that assigned by A. Heintz, privileged to see the sketches, to the completion of act iii. **The 27th of December 1854** left Brynhild sleeping midst the lambent flames.

Here again I must enter a caveat, against a misleading label that has done duty far too long for the theme to which the curtains close upon *Die Walküre*. Every analyst, from the first a generation back, down to (but not including) the last some seven years since, has obstinately called this theme "the Slumber-motive." Now see the consequences! About midway in that period a most intelligent anti-Wagnerian—had he lived a little longer, he would probably have become an ardent convert—Edmund Gurney by name, thus described his sensations on listening to the musical interlude in act iii of *Siegfried:* "Having been forewarned of this passage, I felt my pleasure in listening to it distinctly increased by the idea that the hero's advance through the flames was typified by the manner in which the melodic strain seems again and again to force its way through the changing harmonies. What, then, was my chagrin, on consulting the *Guide through the Music*, to

discover that the strain was the 'slumber-motive,' and that what was really being typified was Brynhild's repose."

Well, these words of Gurney's are quoted by a recent exponent of the art of "scientific criticism" as a convincing proof that Wagner's system is radically faulty, or at least that "the leading motives have not always told their own tale, because we had not the key to their concrete signification." On the contrary, poor Gurney *had* been "told the tale" by scenery and music combined, and formed an idea of it in perfect harmony with all other appearances of the motive; but he rashly consulted a "key" or guide-book, and was promptly confounded through a name invented on the other side of the Atlantic by a gentleman who had never seen the work performed (385*n ant.*), a shibboleth passed on from mouth to mouth rather against than with the composer's sanction! "Scientific criticism" might surely have asked itself a simple question: Am I to quarrel with Shakespeare because I fall out with Gervinus? Do let us be sensible, even though impotent to scale the dizzy heights of "science": if a label offend thee, cut it off and cast it from thee.

As Dr Burghold has justly pointed out, "Slumber-motive" is a thorough misnomer, and should be replaced by some title indicating the *fire-waves* summoned to defend the slumberer. Quite another theme is specially devoted to Sleep, those grey descending chords we hear at Wotan's words "In festen Schlaf verschliess' ich dich," a theme most closely related to that of Wotan's aimless "Wandering" in *Siegfried*, when the sleep-compeller himself has passed into the land of dreams, become in a sense a sleep-walker. Moreover, the first time we ever hear the disputed motive * is not at Brynhild's reply "Soll fesselnder Schlaf," where we should expect it if its label were correct, but four lines later (in minor) with her plea for mitigation of the penalty, "diess

---

* I must politely demur to Wolzogen's detection of this "slumber-motive" in act ii, where Siegmund anxiously listens for the breathing of Sieglinde, uncertain if she be asleep or dead. Here an arbitrary label has deceived either a too eager ear, or an eye that had not studied the orchestral score. A. Heintz falls open-eyed into the trap, accepting the allusion in childlike faith, on account of its label, but meekly remarking that the motive is "scarcely recognisable here, owing to the ternary rhythm." Quite so: are we never to allow Wagner to have a spontaneous inspiration beyond our canonical set of themes?

Eine musst du erhören." Then the two motives, the true Sleep theme and this wrongly-styled "slumber-motive," are instructively combined at the lines that formulate her petition, "die Schlafende schütze mit scheuchenden Schrecken," directly followed by Siegfried's personal or "hero" theme at her words, "dass nur ein furchtlos freiester Held hier auf dem Felsen einst mich fänd'!" Nothing could possibly be plainer; particularly when we find the disputed motive immediately re-entering to accompany Wotan's "Zu viel begehr'st du, zu viel der Gunst!" Brynhild had not desired to be sent to sleep: that was her punishment: the "favour" she asked was protection against *cowardly* awakeners, by a wall of living flame.

That is Dr Burghold's position, stated a little differently; and I cordially agree with him. At last we are not bidden to stand on our heads, in order to see recondite reasons for introduction of the "slumber-motive" into Mime's fear-lesson in *Siegfried* i: Mime himself has just experienced a fit of terror at the "flickering light" that marked the Wanderer's departure; he now describes the fear inspired in craven hearts by "wirres Flackern" in the gloaming: what more natural, than a gradual conversion of one of the well-known fire-motives to the attractive form it presents to the adventurous youth predestined to break through a wall of flame? And now, if you look into the score, or but recall your memory of *Die Walküre's* final tableau, you will perceive that this disputed motive is absolutely made to evolve there from its own true source, the group of Loge motives; Fire itself is purged of its chromatic fitfulness, as Loge is tamed by Wotan's spear; whilst the close of the first great half of the tetralogy is symbolically brought into most perfect harmony with its beginning—the introduction to *Das Rheingold*. With what is virtually the end of the reign of the gods, the world returns to its elemental state, in preparation for the next avatar: the element of Fire, rid of its wasting fret and fume, here shews its kinship (even musically) with the element of Water. Surely that is more in keeping with the *poet's* thought, than a supposed eternal harping on a virgin's slumber. Call it the flames' lullaby, as for private use you probably have, and at least you will not neglect the general picture; but don't let us take a phrase in continuous, though gentle motion, to typify death-like rest. Dr Burghold tentatively invents a new label, "Waberlohe," signifying

"Wavering blaze"; though, if a name we must have, "Shield of flame" would occur to me as more appropriate. The great thing, however, is to emancipate ourselves from false denominators; otherwise we shall soon be having "pickled cabbage" motives sprung upon us, for a bed of roses, because one rose does share that useful vegetable's patronymic.

After the above, you may think me inconsistent in what follows. Yet, to call the Brighton Road the Bath Road, may lead to serious complications; whereas if one merely lights upon a pleasant by-way, and gives it a pet name for recognition by familiar friends, not even a County Council can say one nay. And this, which I will timidly call "the joyful secret," has not been snapped up by the speculative builder; no red-brick villas desecrate its sanctity as yet. Compact of but two syncopated bars (ex. *a*), it directly precedes Brynhild's announcement to Sieglinde of the surpassing hero to be born of her, "Denn Eines wiss'" etc.:

A tiny masterpiece. See how beautifully the syncopations depict the catching breath of a herald of glad tidings, already foreshadowed in that light crescendo a few pages earlier, "Rette das Pfand, das von ihm du empfing'st." It is the first time that this warrior virgin has been brought face to face with the joy of motherhood, and nothing could be more delicate than the way in which she literally 'breaks' the news. Then turn to example *b*, accompanying Brynhild's chaste avowal to Siegfried "Du selbst bin ich, wenn du mich Selige liebst," just after she has answered his naive question anent his mother Sieglinde, and repeated at her words "Dich liebt' ich immer." Even before his birth she had loved him: the association of ideas is obvious. And when we meet a variant of this subsidiary theme in *Gtdg* ii, where the

heroine appeals to the memory of their days of bliss ("darin so wonnig ruht' an der Wand Nothung, der treue Freund"), we understand what the master meant at the Bayreuth rehearsals by terming this "a secret known only to herself and Siegfried." The little chain is complete, no matter whether you derive its last link from a better-known 'motive' or not.

Of such feather-light touches or half-hidden beauties these scores are full, offering endless delight even to the solitary student at the pianoforte; for which purpose not one of them offers richer store of treasures than *Die Walküre* (—by the way, be sure to accent the first syllable, the *a*, not the second). Its composer's later music may be more elaborately instrumented, but for melodic wealth and variety of ideas I always feel that this "first day" takes first place; and were I asked which of Wagner's music-dramas I could least afford to be deprived of, albeit hesitant as thought flew to *Tristan*, I think I should answer *Die Walküre*. Was there ever a more perfect tragedy than this, a more undiluted tragedy, even in the days of ancient Greece? It is classic in the contours of its every scene, a temple to which one returns to worship with greater and yet greater fervour.

Let me close this chapter with the dramatist's own words to Liszt in the Spring of 1856, when at last the scoring of the third act also stood complete: "It is achieved; probably the best I have written yet. A terrible storm—of elements and hearts—that gradually calms to Brynhild's wonder-sleep."

* * *

Dear Reader, this page is merely an apology for a chapter that should have come here, had its predecessors not been over-greedy. Not wishing to leave our hero in mid-air, I will just enumerate the outward events of his winter 1854-5, deferring till next volume a full account thereof.

Dec. 12, '54, evidently *ca* the same day as his Schopenhauer-letter to Liszt—as that contains the words, "Thus I'm continually ripening: simply for pastime do I still play with Art. From the accompanying sheet you will see how I try to entertain myself" —a quartet-soirée is given at Zurich, including Beethoven's op. 131, into the mysteries of which he has initiated the executants, and for which he has written a miniature programme, ending with "the most sorrowful resignation of all happiness on earth" (cf. *P.* VIII. 386). That is midway through act iii of *Walküre*.

Jan. 9, 1855, the composition of *Die Walküre* finished a fortnight back, he conducts the first of five Zurich 'Panharmonic' concerts. At the second of these, Jan. 23, he presents his *Faust*-overture for the first time in its new dress, on which he has been at work since the year's beginning. At the fifth, Feb. 20, he repeats that rendering for his temporary farewell, together with Gluck's overture to *Iph. in Aulis* and his own to *Tannhäuser*, the prelude and Bridal procession from *Lohengrin*.

Feb. 23, '55, he allows himself to be prevailed upon to break that farewell by conducting the third performance of his *Tannhäuser* opera, first mounted at the Zurich theatre a week before.

Feb. 26 he starts for London, there to remain the best part of four months, with the Philharmonic Society's concert-engagement in his pocket, but also—the wellnigh-completed full score of act i of *Die Walküre*.

APPENDIX.

SUPPLEMENTAL NOTES.

SUPPLEMENTAL NOTES.

Siegfried's lesson in Fear (*p.* 421).—*Revision of "Young Siegfried" in* 1852 (*p.* 426).—*Adolf Stahr on the Ring-poem* (438).—*Schopenhauer's private copy of the Ring-poem* (440).—*Bettina, the Grimms, and the Ring-poem* (446).—*Wagner's pianoforte works* (448).—*Albert and Johanna Wagner* (453).—*Letter on Technical criticism* (466).—*Bülow's Pianoforte-arrangements* (468).—*Wagner's letters to Schindelmeisser* (473).—*First printed textbook of Lohengrin* (478).—*Wagner and the Berlin Court-theatre* (489).—*Dorn's "Nibelungen" opera* (498).—*To Bülow on Harmony* (505).—*A Lisztianer's mare's nest, with a word on "Leitmotive"* (510).

Page 25. SIEGFRIED'S LESSON IN FEAR.—To fit the subjoined translation from the 1853 edition of the RING into its corresponding place in the ultimate version, the reader should take page 18 of the ordinary *Siegfried* textbook and temporarily strike out from Siegfried's first speech there all but its first five lines (ending "mühe dich rasch"), substituting for the remainder merely "dass ich heut' noch die Waffe gewinn'!" Then retain Mime's "Was willst du noch heut' mit dem Schwert?" and all Siegfried's "Aus dem Wald fort" etc., till the lad rushes into the wood (*ib.* 19). Instead of Mime's ensuing brief soliloquy, in 1853 we have the following lengthy scene, consisting of 183 verses, the first whereof, "Halte! halte! wohin?" is common to both versions:—

Mime (in utmost alarm). Wait, wait! Where are you going? Listen, Siegfried, listen! He's off at a bound! Hei, Siegfried! How keep the boy tied here? (He shouts into the forest at top of his voice). I have not told you all yet: of your mother there's more to be heard! Would you scorn your mother's counsel?

Siegfried (returning). My mother?—speak up!

Mime. Come in, then; take the old man's word: you still must know something of weight.

Siegfried (re-enters). Here I am: what else have you hid from me?

Mime (embarrassed). Eh! It needs a little thinking. (Coughs.) Stay, tho': I have it, what you ought to be told.—You want to go forth from the wood to the world?*—Hear what your mother to Mime

* On the not improbable assumption, that in the very earliest version (summer '51) Siegfried did *not* leave the cave after his "Aus dem Wald fort in die Welt zieh'n," the dialogue might easily have passed straight from the end of that speech to the spot indicated above, with its "Du willst aus dem Wald fort in die Welt?—Hör' was deine Mutter Mime vertraut," and so on.

confided.—"Mime," said she, "man of sense! When my child some day grows up, keep the madcap safe in the wood! The world is deceitful and false, sets traps for the simple: those alone who have learnt what fear is, can hope to hold their own there."

Siegfried. Is that what my mother told you?

Mime. Believe me, her very words.

Siegfried. I wish to learn fear, then.

Mime. To the clever it comes quite easy; to dullards the lesson is hard. The knowing man peers and spies around for any sign of danger: when the foe draws near, he crouches low, that the ruffian may not find him.

Siegfried. And that would be fear, Mime?

Mime. 'Tis the cunning fear teaches us: the fruit of fear.

Siegfried. Cunning I know; from the fox have I learnt it: but who will teach me fear?

Mime. See how dull you still are, not to know it! And you'd be off to the world?—Quick tho' you be to the wood's ways, in the world your eye will cheat you: your eye may look, your ear may hark—you'll see nor hear aught of the peril in lurk for you, if fear has not shewn, and taught you with cunning to foil it.

Siegfried. Fear I must learn, then.

Mime. When your eye sees clear no longer, when your ear but hears as if dreaming; when some horror whirs nearer and nearer; when your senses all reel and your limbs are a-stagger; when your heart goes thump-thump at your breast—then fear you have learnt.

Siegfried. Now I feel that I've never learnt it.

Mime. Foolish lad, silly child, abide in the wood, let the world be! 'Tis your mother that warns you; for her sake let it be! If you have not felt fear yet, in the world you are lost: as your father fell, will you fall; be warned by your mother's woe! Whose senses fear has not reborn, in the world he will go blind: where nothing you see, you'll be devoured; where nothing you hear, your heart will be hit. Steel cannot cut until tempered by fire: whose senses fear has not sharpened, blind and deaf will the waves of the world gulp him down. Give ear, then, to the old man's word: stay, foolish one, stay in the wood!

Siegfried. Fear I must and will learn. Your wits will never win it me: so forth from the wood to the world, that alone can teach me! Were I to sit moping here all day, dull, blind, and deaf, I should stay. An I learn it, an I learn it not, where's fear to be learnt will I be! So hark to my bidding; get ready the sword; sweat its stout shards to a whole! Palm no poor toy on me: those splinters are all I put faith in. If I find you've been dawdling; if I find it amiss; if you serve me a makeshift, or bring me a botch—I warn you,

old one, best look out! For, an I quit you to learn about fearing I'll teach you what thrashing is first! (Runs into the forest).

Mime (alone). So here I sit, with insult added to disgrace; the old trouble crossed with a new; the last nail driven into me!—Fatal greed, that would covet the ring's curst gold! Pretty thanks this old fool has earned himself!—Tough work have I had, to bring the child up, that for my sake the deed he might do: me alone should he cleave to, and me alone he hates! Accursed brood from the rut of Man—and worse when Gods have mixed in't!—Whatever I plot, turns against me; in every springe I snare myself: with Fear I hoped to bait him; with fear he baits myself! How hold him to home now, till my end he has served? (Ponders.) He fain would learn fear: were that the chain to bind him? Should I offer myself as teacher, lead my pupil to Fafner's nest?—I might wheedle the booby that way, be helped to the hoard after all!—But the sword—there swims my head again!—How weld the pieces of that tricksy steel? No art of dwarves can tame it; how oft have I tried in vain!—Lost labour, useless toil! Shall I have at the task, notwithstanding? For my heating, the pieces ne'er glow; their hardness makes light of my hammer: the only sword of use to me I nevermore can sweat! (Despairing, he totters on to the stool in front of the anvil. Enter the Wanderer.)

From this point the two versions are in entire agreement—save for a few infinitesimal variants, and that substitution of "wild-verzweifeltes" for "viel-zwingendes"—down to the Wanderer's parting words, already given in chapter I. The Wanderer departs, and Mime has his shivering fit—with no apparent cause in '53. Then Siegfried re-enters with the words we are accustomed to, saving that his "Hehe! Mime! du Memme!" were originally represented by "Mime, du Alter! munt'rer Alp!" After his second speech, however, we have another wide divergence in '53: the Fear topic is *resumed*, though naturally at much less length than in the later version, where it is *confined* to this part of the act. Here accordingly, if you wish to figure to yourselves the aspect of the poem as printed in 1853, I must again beg you to run an imaginary pencil through everything after Siegfried's "schärftest du mir das Schwert?" (textbook p. 29, near bottom) till you arrive at his "Feine Finten" (*ib.* 34, near top), and substitute the following:—

Mime (after looking cautiously round). For the sword indeed you ask too early: no time have I found for it yet.

Siegfried. Let's see how far you've got.

Mime (ill at ease, mounts the stool again). The sword? Let that be, for the nonce! I've been thinking out something of moment, and hadn't yet reached the sword.

Siegfried. Never mind what you've been thinking out! Bring out the sword: this very day I'm off into the world, to leave you far behind.

Mime. The sword can be of no use at all to you, if you have not first learnt fear. For you alone I was troubling; in deep thought had I sunk, how to teach you to fear: you came back just as I had found it.

Siegfried. Sunk you had, right under the seat! Out with it: what did you find there?

Mime (as if confiding a secret). I know of a spot in the wood, toward the east, not far from the world; Neidhöle 'tis called. There dwells a dreadful worm, has slain and swallowed many: if you found him, he'd teach you what fear is.

Siegfried. To learn it, how shall I find him?

Mime. I'll guide you myself; you need but to follow.

Siegfried. 'Twere an end to my trouble. So up, Mime, no more delay! I don't mean to abide with you longer; so trim me the sword in a trice! With that I'll learn all about fear.

Mime. Never will you learn it with a sword baked by me: see how many of the stoutest you've snapped before—yet fear stayed far from you as ever. (*Siegfried*, "Feine Finten" etc., as in the later version.)

As both these passages are by no means easy to render into passable English without destroying their naïve simplicity of style, I should like to append their German. That, however, would take up too much space; so I must refer the scholar to a reprint (including a few regrettable, but harmless *mis*prints) in the *Bayreuther Blätter* of 1896, pp. 205 et seq. The said reprint is succeeded by a lucid and circumstantial analysis by the editor (covering practically all the variants as between the 53 and 63 editions of the whole RING poem), from which I will quote the following remarks, after a little condensation, since they render any further comment of my own superfluous:—

"In the first place it must be conceded that, after his extremely effective and vivacious exit, Siegfried's return to the cave in answer to Mime's summons was in itself at variance with the impetuous character of the lad, who would surely cool his heels first in his own free forest. Moreover, that return formed alike an unexpected retardation of the action, and a disturbing repetition of the situation. . . . Then, too, the important 'Fear' theme appears in the first version as a mere fortuitous inspiration of Mime's, as to the origin whereof he gives us no more than a hint, with his notion of thereby keeping the lad from the world awhile until he shall have served his purpose. One has a sort of feeling that the poet, who 'to his alarm' had just discovered that his Siegfried was the fabled youth who knew no fear (letter to Uhlig of May 10, 51), had made haste to profit by that fresh discovery without further ado. Certainly the lesson is given a very telling motive, for Siegfried's mind, through reference to his 'mother's coun-

sel,' as it still is in the later version; but it rather grates on our instincts, to hear that counsel quoted by Mime in direct narration, as in 1853: '*Mime*'—*sprach sie*—'*kluger Mann*.' From the mouth of the dying Sieglinde, herself a native of the woods with so little experience of the world's 'wiles,' but only of its 'violence,' we should not expect those measured words of warning, 'Die Welt ist tückisch und falsch, dem Thör'gen stellt sie Fallen'; and even if one explained them as a trumped-up tale of Mime's, they would hardly be the type of last maternal message profoundly to move the childlike heart of a fearless world-ignorant Siegfried.

"In fact, Mime's whole exposition of 'Fear' in the earlier version has a thoroughly didactic character, taking the form of proverbs about worldly wisdom such as could scarcely have occurred to a dwarf from Nibelheim in his backwoods-smithy, and in no case could have had any effect on the forest-lad, unaccustomed to think in abstractions. Here everything must be terse and pithy, drawn live from *observation*, to be true and telling. Maxims such as might stand very well in the Eddaic Hâvamâl, and possibly were even influenced by a recollection thereof, may readily pass muster as excellent ideas or interesting adaptations for the *poet* who speaks direct to the hearer; but they form no natural expression for the *personages* of his poem. For them the manner of the later version quite suffices: a description of the physical effects of fear, and tidings of the Neidhöhle as practical school for learning it.—The one happy remark of Siegfried's in the earlier version, that he had already learnt cunning from the fox, does not compensate for the marring of the nature-atmosphere in which the whole first scene had been maintained; moreover, it simply repeats a motive employed before.—The later version not only avoids this divergence of style in one and the same scene, by reserving the lesson in Fear until after the Wanderer's visit, but also preserves full naturalness of tone and terseness of expression.

"Another point. If you take Siegfried's brief interjections by themselves, they present indeed a certain development in his attitude towards the question:—'Das Fürchten *möcht'* ich lernen'—'*Das wäre* das Fürchten?'—'*Wer* aber *lehrt* mich das Fürchten?'—'Das Fürchten *muss* ich drum lernen'—'Nun fühl' ich, das *lernt'* ich *noch nicht'*—and last of all, 'Das Fürchten *mag* und *muss* ich lernen: *durch deinen Witz* gewinn' ich's nie!' Separated by *five* longish speeches of Mime's, however, they are robbed of their progressive character, appear monotonous, and arouse a feeling that the action—the inner one in this case—has really remained at a standstill."

Freiherr von Wolzogen has a good deal more to the same effect, dwelling especially on the gain arising from the alteration in the Wanderer's parting words; with all of which I so fully agree, that, to reproduce it, would only be to repeat part of what I have already said

in chapter I. It is rather in self-defence that I have summoned a supporter from the headquarters of Wagnerian orthodoxy. If it be permissible even there, to criticise by no means flatteringly an integral portion of the poem as printed in 1853, exception surely should not be taken to my indication of other weak spots in the "Siegfried" dramas which the poet *omitted* to rectify thereafter.

Page 39. REVISION OF "YOUNG SIEGFRIED" IN 1852.—The day after Wagner had completed the poem of *Die Walküre* he wrote to Uhlig (July 2, '52): "Die beiden Siegfriede müssen jetzt stark überarbeitet werden, namentlich in Allem was den eigentlichen Göttermythos betrifft, denn dieser hat nun eine allerdings viel präcisere und ergreifendere Physiognomie gewonnen." I have already quoted this sentence in vol iii (p. 331), and since referred to it from time to time; but it is so vital to our present purpose, that a still more literal translation becomes imperative: "The two Siegfrieds will now have to be heavily revised, especially in all that concerns the actual Gods'-myth, since that has acquired an at anyrate much preciser and more affecting physiognomy." Here the qualification "at anyrate"—"*allerdings*"—had escaped the notice of us all; it seemed a negligible pleonasm, as every commentator took it for granted that the "Gods'-myth" had ended quite *differently* in "the two Siegfrieds" from its dénouement in the RING itself. But that remarkable gloss on the newly-discovered fair-copy of the older *Siegfried's Tod* has already opened our eyes to possibilities undreamt before; and it now appears as good as certain that in the summer of 1851, when the poem of *Der junge Siegfried* was created, the Gods were meant to meet a tragic end, not have their power established for them by a human hero. This view is confirmed by that insignificant-looking "at anyrate," and consequently we have to dismiss the notion that, wherever the ultimate poem of *Siegfried* foreshadows a tragic termination of the larger plot, no additional evidence of change in '52 is needed. Our line of argument cannot henceforth be so simple as that which I provisionally employed in vol iii (p. 447), where I observed that "Wotan could never have been disarmed by his chosen champion." When I arrive at the scene in question, I shall have other, and I believe, better grounds to adduce for that particular conclusion; but meanwhile we must bear sharply in mind that it is the *mode* of the Gods' downfall, and not the event itself, that has "acquired a much more affecting physiognomy" since *Das Rheingold* was drafted and *Die Walküre* written, whilst the whole myth has attained a precision of detail it still lacked in 1851. It is chiefly for this reason that in cap. I. of the present volume I broke off my discussion of *D. j. Siegfried* at act i: until the 1849 fair-copy of the *Tod* had been dealt with, it would have been futile to proceed any farther.

Still there is another preliminary point to be considered. "The two Siegfrieds will now have to be *heavily* revised," we have just heard Wagner say in July '52; but when it actually came to that revision, next November, we found that the time devoted to the *Young* Siegfried could scarcely exceed a week to ten days, of a couple of hours' work apiece (see vol. iii, 436 and 450). The revision, accordingly, cannot have been so "heavy" as once intended, but must have been confined to a few important scenes, and a little hurried at that. In act i we have discovered but the faintest traces thereof: in acts ii and iii we should naturally expect rather more, in some places a good deal more, as the Gods'-myth plays a much greater part there. To act ii of *Siegfried* we will therefore pass at once, where we shall find the said myth working its way to the front in three several scenes, namely those between Alberich and the Wanderer, betwen Siegfried and Fafner, and between Alberich and Mime. I will take these in an inverse order, leaving the first and most important to the last.

About the date of origin of Alberich's spirited dispute with Mime there can be no shade of doubt: incontestably it is a reproduction from the original 1851 poem, as evinced by the strophic form in which it is cast. True, we have the welding of the ring and tarnhelm outlined in a fashion which suggests *Das Rheingold;* but so had it also been in the "Nibelungen-Myth" of '48. What stamps the scene as all of one piece, unretouched, is that tell-tale line already mentioned, "Dir Zagem entrissen ihn Riesen," where we have a counterpart of the Wanderer's second answer in act i, namely a conception of the capture of the ring peculiar to *Siegfried* itself, i.e. to 1851, and at variance alike with the original *S. Tod* and the 1852 *Rheingold*. It is a little odd that Wagner should have overlooked this in November '52, yet not so odd as the former case; since this was not a scene he had explicitly marked for revision a year before, whereas the other was.

Neither was the Siegfried-Fafner scene one of those specifically set down for revision; but in that part of it which follows the combat there are decided signs of a maturer hand. Here the mythology of the Giants differs from that implicit in act i, as already shewn, and I should therefore assign almost the whole of Fafner's dying speech to the end of 1852. Perhaps the "Blicke nun hell" to "acht' auf mich," where the accent is again on the *hoard*, may date from '51; but there is a pathos about "Du helläugiger Knabe, unkund deiner selbst" and "den letzten Riesen fällte ein rosiger Held," that seems to belong to the "more affecting physiognomy."

The Alberich-Wanderer scene offers a far more complex problem. That Wagner fulfilled his intention of revising it in '52, we may be positive, as it is one of those situations in which the Gods'-myth occupies the whole canvas; but it is another question, whether anything remains, and if so, how much, of the work of '51. What we

have to ask ourselves in the first place, is this : Was the Wanderer's identity revealed to Alberich in '51 any more than it had been to Mime, or was that revelation then deferred till the scene with the Wala, thus lending more telling effect to her "Du bist—nicht was du dich nenn'st!" The answer is by no means so easy as might appear. In this drama there had been no previous reference to any direct transaction between Wotan and Alberich, nothing but the general "obedience" shewn by all the Nibelungen to the "strong lord of the spear"; yet Alberich's *first* exclamation is "*Du selbst* lässt dich hier seh'n?" and he at once proceeds to heap the Wanderer with abuse, as if the audience knew perfectly well it was Wotan, before he arrives at connecting him with the runic spear. Moreover, in course of that abuse he charges this mysterious Wanderer with having robbed him of the ring in olden days, though we had heard in act i that it was the Giants who did so. That is not the way in which Wagner usually introduces his characters to one another; and in fact the Wanderer's own first remark to the dwarf begins by giving us the latter's name, "Schwarz-Alberich, schweif'st du hier? hütest du Fafner's Haus?" There we distinctly have '51, just as we also have it in the stranger's next remark, "wer wehrte mir Wand'rers Fahrt?"—having given us the name of his interlocutor, the Wanderer informs him of that which is to pass current for his own, precisely as he had informed Mime in act i.

Now, if the Wanderer's identity was *not* instantly recognised by Alberich in '51, the whole scene must necessarily have steered a different course, been utilised almost solely for the objective narration of previous history by the same expedient of question and answer adopted in act i. That, as a matter of fact, is virtually established in the letter of Nov. '51 to Liszt, where the "splendid matter for portrayal" through *Rheingold* is referred to as already "indicated in the scenes between Alberich and the Wanderer in the second act of 'Young Siegfried,' and the Wanderer and Mime in the first act." Surely this implies that the original opening scene of act ii had furnished a fairly coherent account of the manner in which Alberich obtained the gold from the Rhine, made his ring from it, was tricked or robbed of that ring, how he cursed it and proposed to regain it. Such a detailed narrative was quite unnecessary in 52, coming after two whole dramas, but would certainly be supplied to the audience in 51, seeing that this "Young Siegfried" was deliberately projected to clear up all the antecedents of its one companion drama, *Siegfried's Tod*. Of such a narrative there remains but a fragment; and that fragment, even if preserving *some* features of the original,* includes three lines, "die deine Burg

* I will not lay too much stress on the fact that a plurality of Giants is still subsumed, "Nicht du darfst, was als Zoll du gezahlt, *den Riesen* wieder

dir gebaut: was mit den trotzigen einst du vertragen," that come almost straight from *Rheingold* ("die dort die Burg mir gebaut; durch Vertrag zähmt' ich ihr trotzig Gezücht," *Rh.* 20). On the whole, then, the Wanderer-Alberich scene may be taken as presenting a different aspect in 1852 to that of 1851. Let us try if it be possible to sift out the work of the one year from that of the other.

The first four lines of the act and of Alberich's soliloquy, "In Wald und Nacht . . . lugt mein Aug'," must surely be of '51, since they repeat expressions already used in the original fear-episode of act i. The next four lines, "Banger Tag, beb'st du schon auf? dämmerst du dort durch das Dunkel her?" bear an equally indisputable likeness to the Norns' scene of 52. The following six stand on neutral ground, rather inclining to '51. Then "Naht schon des Wurmes Würger? ist's schon, der Fafner fällt?" suggest '51, whilst the next three, or possibly four lines look like 52, as they remind us of *Die Walküre*.—The Wanderer's brief monologue, "Zur Neidhöhle" etc., is of no great moment, but probably assignable to 51, together with his first two contributions to the duologue (*vid. sup.*). On the contrary, Alberich's first exclamation to the Wanderer, "Du selbst lässt dich hier seh'n?" is so intensely dramatic, to us who have witnessed the first two plays, that I can hardly imagine his four-line speech to have been written before their actual creation. The same remark applies to his next speech, "Jag'st du auf neue Neidthat umher?" etc. In his long speech that follows, the very first line, "Du Rath wüthender Ränke!" is of such power that I cannot conceive it to be other than the work of the RING-poet at top of his bent. So with almost the whole of this long tirade of Alberich's (note the "zerspelltest," cf. *Gtdg* p. 39), and with the beginning and end of that which succeeds it, more particularly the lines "und wie dir's im Busen doch bangt" and "Das sehrt dich mit ew'ger Sorge" (the middle part, where stress is laid once more on the hoard, falling to 51). For the same reason I should assign to 1852 the middle portion and last line of Alberich's brief monologue after the Wanderer's departure: compare this "Doch lacht nur zu, ihr leichtsinniges, lustgieriges Göttergelichter" with p. 59 of *Rheingold*, "Des Unseligsten, Angstversehrten fluchfertige, furchtbare That," and you find an exactly equal strength of stroke, such as could scarcely be developed before Alberich himself had grown into one of the most sharply-outlined of all the figures in the RING.

There is no necessity for scanning this scene line by line, and I will confess that regarding some parts of it I should not care to

---

entreissen," as past and present could scarcely be disentangled here with any regard for poetry. Nevertheless the last clause bears a strong resemblance to Mime's "Dir Zagem entrissen ihn Riesen." For the rest, it would have been the easiest thing in the world to alter the third person singular into the second.

commit myself to a definite conclusion. All I have proposed, is to offer a clue in the event of our never recovering what would render all further conjectures superfluous, to wit the original 1851 poem itself. I will therefore merely add a few hints as to the Wanderer's part in the duologue :—

The most interesting problem, not only of this scene, but of its twofold sequel in act iii, is that of the original attitude of Wotan toward the ring. What though the dénouement of *Siegfried's Tod* had already become a tragic one for Walhall and its denizens, it does not necessarily follow that the god had *voluntarily* abandoned all his cherished plans by the time *Young* Siegfried was written. As there is no indication of Wotan's having by then lost his "*fear* of the end," i.e. his fear lest the all-powerful ring might pass into actively hostile hands, we may confidently assume that his answer to Alberich's threat, "Deinen Sinn kenn' ich ; doch sorgt er mich nicht," was either no portion of the '51 work, or led to a different conclusion, even if that threat itself then existed, which I have disputed above. A Wotan still intent on supremacy could not be so indifferent to his future fate as the Wotan we have met in act ii of *Die Walküre*. Thus in his assumed character of "wise wanderer" he might answer Alberich's inquiries of '51 with "dein Bruder bringt dir Gefahr ; einen Knaben führt er daher, der Fafner ihm fällen soll. . . Höre mich wohl, sei auf der Hut : nicht kennt der Knabe den Ring, doch Mime kundet' ihn aus" ; but at least the last two of the four intervening lines, "Drum sag' ich dir, Gesell : thue frei wie's dir frommt," must be an interpolation, since they turn "Höre mich wohl" etc. into a non-sequitur. Similarly "Ein Helde naht" down to "wer ihn rafft, hat ihn gewonnen" (p. 47) would be quite in keeping with the riddling style of '51 ; whereas "Wen ich liebe" to "Helden nur können mir frommen" (top of the page), together with the surprised inquiry of Alberich's that calls them forth, seem to belong to the revision.

The duologue between Alberich and the Wanderer passes into a triangular scene for those two characters and Fafner. Would this be part of the 1851 poem? Decidedly, I should say, with exception perhaps of a line or two, as it is quite in the humorous vein originally intended : e.g. Alberich addressing the Worm as a "holy one" ("dich Heil'gen") ; his lines ending "und ruhig leb'st du lang" have also a strophic look of '51. The Wanderer's "Doch schilt mich nicht mehr *Schelm*," on the contrary, could only follow a scene in which Alberich had been roundly abusing him ; so that there may be some question as to the date of "Alles ist nach seiner Art" etc., with which this scene concludes, though it is more in the objectively enigmatic style that would be affected by a god who still concealed his identity. —With the succeeding brief monologue I have already dealt, and thus shewn that from beginning to end of the Wanderer's interview

with Alberich there is reason to believe that we are faced with a composite work, a foundation of 1851 with a superstructure of 1852. What shall we find in the two Wanderer scenes of act iii ?

The music of the Erda scene is so superb, so overwhelming, that its verbal text wellnigh escapes attention till frequent repetition has made it so familiar that one then regards it as a kind of liturgy. Nevertheless, on the one hand that text is among the finest beauties of the whole tetralogy, on the other it presents some of the usual difficulties due to the grafting of a new conception on an old. Purposeless has the conjuration of Erda been called, by those who insist on a matter-of-fact issue to everything ; and perhaps it does lead to no tangible result, in the scene's present form, beyond a purely artistic contrast with that other "awakening" which the act is to offer in further course. In its original form, however, not only was it necessary to give the audience a certain amount of preliminary information as to the recumbent figure so soon to be displayed, but the Wala herself must assuredly have returned some definite answer to Wanderer-Wotan's all-important question, "wie zu hemmen ein rollendes Rad ?" That answer is denied us now, since the Wanderer brusquely refuses to hear any more "grandmother-wisdom" ; yet it may not be impossible to reconstruct it for ourselves, if we can picture its antecedent conditions in 1851.

To gain an approximate idea of the original reading, we must adhere to the principle adopted with the opening of act ii : we must blot out from our recollection the last scene of *Rheingold* and Wotan's long soliloquy in the *Walküre*. Thus it will no longer be the more or less individualised Erda, that we have before us in 51, but simply "the Wala" of the letter to Liszt, i.e. the weird soothsayer of the Vegtamskvida, about which Miss Weston will oblige us with particulars :—"This poem is closely connected with another, 'Odin's Rabenzauber,' which recounts the dismay of the gods at the portents foreboding Baldur's death and the coming Götterdämmerung. Odin, while the other gods sit in council, mounts his horse, Sleipnir, and rides to Niflheim, where he wakes the dead Wala, the prophetess, from her last slumber, and, hiding his identity under the name of Vegtam, forces her to answer the questions he puts to her. But from her dark sayings he wins no comfort, and the two finally reproach each other, 'Du bist nicht Vegtam, Odin bist du, der Allerschaffer,' while Odin retorts — 'Du bist keine Vala, kein wissendes Weib : Vielmehr bist du dreier Thursen Mutter'—stanzas of which the words in the drama appear to be a reminiscence. No such connection as that indicated by Wagner appears to have really existed between Odin and the Wala" (*Legends of the Wagner Drama* pp. 104-5). Naturally Wagner was not slavishly following his 'source,' but we may take it for granted that, however much he may have diverged from the course

of the Vegtamskvida dialogue, in 51 he would have no object in converting this Wala not only into the mother of the Norns (an improvement on the "three monsters"), but *also* into Wotan's paramour and mother of Brünnhilde—a development reserved for the tetralogy. Therefore we start with a Wala whom the Wanderer has never seen before, and whose reputed wisdom he for the first time consults, "alles, *sagt man*, sei dir bekannt" (*S.* 74). Bearing that in mind, an examination of this scene may possibly disclose what parts of it belong to 51, what parts to 52, and haply account for an occasional stumbling-block.

The whole of the opening portion, namely the Wanderer's first three speeches and the Wala's two intervening replies, incontestably formed part of the original poem, as evidenced among other things by their strophic versification: simply the "Erda! Erda! Ewiges Weib!" with its repetition as refrain to the invocation, would be added in 52. When we arrive at the first four verses of Erda's third reply, however, "Männerthaten . . . bezwang ein Waltender einst," we have a sudden break in style. Nevertheless the main body of this reply is clearly 51 work, modified in merely a word or two: in place of "Ein Wunschmädchen *gebar ich* Wotan" I should guess that there originally stood "erkor sich," as the real meaning of these "wish-maidens" of the old myths is "adoptive daughters," and "erkor" would supply the missing stabreim; whilst the "und frägst" would only need to be followed by a "nicht sie," or something similar, and "*Erda's und* Wotan's Kind" would not yet have been born.

The Wanderer's next speech, "Die Walküre mein'st du, Brünnhild', die Maid?"—a strange expression from father to mother—has a decided air of 51,* but with a few lines added or revised. That need not detain us, as Wagner himself has informed us that the original scene contained some account of the subject of his future *Walküre*. Did it contain a further instalment? If so, that must have followed the Wala's next rejoinder, which is decidedly of the composite order: "Wirr wird mir's seit ich erwacht: wild und kraus kreis't die Welt"—assuredly dates from '52, cf "nichts mehr gewahr' ich . . . ein wüstes Gesicht wirrt mir wüthend den Sinn" of the new Norns' scene (*Gtdg* 9); whilst "der Wala Kind" and "die wissende Mutter" point to the next four verses having been revised. But the important question, here, is that of the eight succeeding lines. "Der den Trotz lehrte, straft den Trotz?" is certainly a rejoinder to have been expected in 51, after the Wanderer's "Sie trotzte den Stürmebezwinger": may we not also assign to that year "der die Eide hütet,

* In fact we may trace the "Sie trotzte . . . den Lenker der Schlacht" right back to the original *Siegfried's Tod*, where the Valkyries ask Brynhild, "Wer lehrte dich trotzen dem Lenker der Schlacht?" (*Ges. Schr.* ii, 240).

herrscht durch Meineid"? In the RING, as we know it, Wotan has been guilty of *no* action that could be characterised as perjury or oath-breaking ("Meineid") since Erda last appeared to him; on the contrary, he has protected Fricka's "oaths" in his own despite. That "herrscht durch Meineid" being thus inexplicable in its present surroundings, may it not have originally been accompanied by some further history? Such a supposition is lent colour by the obvious signs of revision in the Wanderer's reply; since his "Urwissend stachest du einst" refers to an incident portrayed in *Rheingold*, whereas in Wagner's first conception of the myth it had been the Norns who warned Wotan to yield up the ring (see *P.* VIII. 302). Here would be room, then, for some instalment of a narrative that might erewhile have explained the accusation of perjury, or perfidy; though the Wanderer's last four lines, "Bist du der Welt" to "wie besiegt die Sorge der Gott," probably occupied their present position from the first.

That Erda's "Du bist—nicht was du dich nenn'st" existed in the original, may be inferred from its similarity to the Eddaic poem; but the whole remainder of the scene must have been radically revised in '52, as it acquaints us with Wotan's maturest decision. In the original poem the Wala must surely have had a further share in the dialogue, some feminine last word, some prophecy to vindicate her summoning. On the supposition that some such oracular utterance was then allotted her, it must either have been a menace of evil as in the Edda (and *Rheingold* thereafter), a promise of deliverance, or a combination of both. Can we detect any vestige of such a thing in the present version? I fancy we can, though my fancy may seem rather daring:—

Radically altered as the end of the scene undoubtedly is, it still presents a group of lines that unmistakably ring true to '51: the five beginning "Der von mir erkoren"* are strophically matched by the five beginning "ledig des Neides," in which the epithet "dem Edlen," as applied to Siegfried, sounds weak from the mouth of *our* Wotan. My conjecture therefore is, that the scene may originally have ended with an alternation of strophe and antistrophe for the Wanderer and Wala respectively: to him would fall "Der von mir erkoren" etc., to *her* "Ledig des Neides [liebesfroh?] erlahmt an dem Edlen Alberich's Fluch; denn fremd bleibt ihm die Furcht" (the first half of which assertion is disproved by subsequent events); then, omitting "die du mir gebarst," as inconsistent with the original story, he would be given something like the following, "Brünnhild—das Weib—weckt hold sich der Held, zur wonnigsten Liebesumarmung" (see vol. iii, 448*n*), whilst she might possibly reply, "Wachend dann wirkt dein

* In *Die Walküre* Siegfried is so far from being the "elect" of Wotan, that the god refuses to hear a word about him; in the full-fledged tetralogy, Siegmund was Wotan's choice, Siegfried is Brynhild's.

Wunsches-Kind erlösende Weltenthat." Or again, *he* may have been given the first two groups, *she* the second two. In either case, and whether uttered by the Wala or the Wanderer, not only is the "erlösende Weltenthat" reflected in the "redeeming woman" of the 1851 *Communication*, but we have seen it anticipated in the "selige Todeserlösung" of the 1849 *S. Tod.* And in the latter connection we perhaps have a clue to the poet's original purpose in summoning the Wala up: redemption of the world by Wotan's wish-daughter she may have prophesied, indeed, yet a redemption involving the downfall of the gods themselves; for in the next scene we find the "machtlos" of that gloss reproduced in the Wanderer's words, "wer sie erweckte, wer sie gewänne, machtlos macht' er mich ewig." Substituting a "dich" for "mich," we have only to suppose them originally given to the Wala, and, with a Wotan not yet attuned to voluntary self-sacrifice, that might be motive enough for his presently attempting to dissuade the hero from piercing the fire to waken his bride.

If it is difficult to account for some of the lines just dealt with, in the absence of connecting links that may once have existed, a still greater difficulty is presented by the following: "Was jene auch wirken—dem ewig Jungen weicht in Wonne der Gott" ("Whatever *those* do, the God yields gleefully to the eternal Young"). Unless Wotan had more than resigned himself to his fate in '51—and such an assumption is excluded even by the frequence of his apparitions—he could hardly have then made use of the expression "dem ewig Jungen *weicht in Wonne* der Gott." Moreover, if you look at that expression closer, it is not to Siegfried in particular, but to "eternal Youth" in general, that place is to be yielded; and that is scarcely consonant with an elaborate plan for the acquisition or advancement of one special hero. Further, the "jene"—on which stress is laid by the stabreim itself—dismisses both Siegfried and Brynhild as possible disappointments, at least in so far as they will probably have no thoughts for anything but themselves at first; and that flatly contradicts the confident prophecy, "*wachend* wirkt . . . erlösende Weltenthat." Here, then, we seem to have the product not merely of a single, but a double revision; and I can only imagine the stoical "Was jene auch wirken," equally with the "Dass *jene* sich lieben" of *Die Walküre* (p. 29 textbook—*vid. sup.*), to have been added at the very last moment, in the act of fair-copying. Whichever way we regard it, it is a most remarkable enigma, which nothing but discovery of the original manuscript might haply solve.

To close our reflections on this scene with something more definite: there can be no doubt at all that the dismissal of Erda, "Urmütter-Furcht! Ur-Sorge," and the "Urmütter-Weisheit geht zu Ende" of the beginning of this long speech of the Wanderer's, date from the

epoch of complete development. They do not advance the outer plot one inch, indeed ; but they confer a new inner purpose on Erda's conjuring up. As it was she who had planted fear in the god's breast in *Rheingold*, so it is she who must hear from his own lips how he has cast that fear behind him. Quite reckless of the fact that much in the next scene will contradict that novel purpose, Wagner here confers upon his Wanderer-Erda scene a meaning worthy of *Die Walküre ;* and if he thus makes the next step of his Wotan a trifle inconsistent, who shall say that he does not thereby make him still more human ?

We reach the last of all the Wanderer scenes, that with Siegfried. Nothing could more palpably belong to the original poem than its opening strophes, down to "schuf ich das Schwert nicht neu" (p. 80), where we have wholly superfluous narrative, since its every incident has been transacted under our eyes on this selfsame day. From this point our road is not quite clear. Siegfried having related his story, the Wanderer has plainly created an opening for introduction of *his*, the story of the sword's divine origin ; yet of that opening no advantage is taken at all in the current version. Was it always thus ? In any case there is a sign of two several readings here, as Siegfried makes practically the same remark, "don't keep me chattering longer" ("lass' mich nicht lange mehr schwatzen"), that he makes a little over a page later (p. 82).—The questions and answers concerning the Wanderer's hat and eye would in the main be '51 work, and that may account for the "missing eye" being explained in a manner quite different to that of *Rheingold* (p. 22). The god's personal appeal to the lad, on the other hand, I should assign to 1852 : there is a force and pathos about the "Kenntest du mich, kühner Spross" and so on, that can scarcely date from a time before the first two dramas of the RING were written.

"Es floh dir zu seinem Heil" ushers in a page the greater part whereof seems to have been retained from the earlier poem. There are important reservations to make, however. The whole tone of his warning against the flames is at variance with the idea that the Wanderer had already "burst into anger," as the stage-direction now informs us—confirmed by his (revised ?) words, "Den Weg, den es zeigte, sollst du nicht zieh'n !" (p. 83). Moreover, between "Fürchte des Felsens Hüter" and "Ein Feuermeer," both palpably of '51, we have five lines—"Verschlossen hält meine Macht die schlafende Maid : wer sie erweckte, wer sie gewänne, machtlos macht' er mich ewig !"—which do not resemble the metre of the surrounding verses, and make a distinct breach in the chain of ideas. They scarcely constitute the kind of appeal an *angry* god would address to so irreverent a youth as Siegfried has amply proved himself, and form an anticlimax to the "nicht wecke mir Neid, er *vernichtete dich* und

mich" of the previous page; yet they are our *only* present intimation that the wakening of Brynhild itself is dreaded by her father, contrary to his delighted anticipation just expressed to Erda; whilst the poem of 1852-3 actually destroys the symbol of his sway as a *preliminary* to that wakening. Neither with the original scene, then, nor with its ultimate revision, will those mysterious lines comply: can they possibly have been borrowed from the preceding scene (*vid. sup.*) and wedged-in at some unheeding moment in the interregnum before the RING itself was taken in hand? We have seen that the "Gods' myth" was in a continual state of flux until its crystallisation in printer's type (Feb. '53); fragments of mutually conflicting conceptions may therefore still adhere to it, more or less obtrusively according to circumstances, in many a situation of the older pair of dramas.

And now for the Wanderer's exit, his final exit; since we hear about him after this, but never see him more. "Zieh' hin! ich kann dich nicht halten!"—not the finest of actors, not the tone-poet himself, has been able to make those words dramatically effective after our seeing the god worsted in hand to hand combat. Does not that in itself suggest their being a survival, and a survival from a scene in which Wotan-Wanderer had stopped short at terrorising, not run the risk of physical obstruction? Omit the two intervening speeches on p. 84, and the "Zieh' hin!" becomes directly connected with Siegfried's "Dort, wo die Brünste brennen, zu Brünnhilde muss ich jetzt hin!" That I opine to have been the connection in 1851, possibly mediated by the single line "Fürchtest das Feuer du nicht": Wotan had allowed himself to be "brushed aside" (as negatively implied in the famous letter of Jan. '54 to Roeckel) after ascertaining that Siegfried was in reality the "fearless hero." For such a termination to the scene, "Zieh' hin &c." would be about all the Wanderer *could* say, whilst it would thoroughly account for the "wich mir der *Feige?*" in Siegfried's astonished exclamation as the Wanderer leaves the stage.

But why do I assume that Wotan's spear originally was not shivered? In the first place, it is distinctly one of those "preciser" details acquired by Wagner's story in its later stages of development, since it has no prototype in legendary sources: in fact the whole individualisation of this spear may be assigned to about the time when the new Norns' scene was first conceived; the breaking of the spear and rending of the rope are intimately connected, and *both* are Wagner's innovations.* In the second place, the combat in act ii of *Die Walküre*, with which this forms so intentional a contrast, had not in 1851 been actu-

* See Dr Wolfgang Golther's *Die sagenwissenschaftlichen Grundlagen der Ring-Dichtung Richard Wagners* (Berlin 1902), in which we are shewn most clearly *where* the poet has enriched the old myths and legends with new ideas or incidents peculiar to his own conception. Unfortunately this valuable little

ally set before us, neither had we seen Wotan himself in the fulness of his power; so that the spear-breaking incident would not have borne anything like its present significance then, whilst it would have defined the tragic termination at far too early a phase in the *pair* of works. In the third place, the Wanderer's whole speech commencing "Fürchtest das Feuer du nicht" is hall-marked with the style of '52, whilst Siegfried's rejoinder, "Meines Vaters Feind &c.," absolutely re-introduces that Vendetta motive which must already have been pruned from acts i and iii of the *Tod*. The one revision very plainly proves the other: the original poem of *D. j. S.* having no word about blood-feud, in '51 the "Rächer's Recht" must be expunged from the *Tod*, where it applied to the Hundings; conversely, if the "Herrlich zur Rache" had existed in *D. j. S.* of '51, the "Rächer's Recht" passage need never have been struck out from the *Tod* at all, as it would have applied perfectly well to the present scene. Thus I consider that we still have every reason to attribute the spear incident to that "preciser and more moving physiognomy" acquired by the Gods-myth in 1852.—

With regard to the Siegfried-Brünnhilde scene of act iii, I will merely add a hint or two to those of volume iii. First, then, for the spot where Brünnhilde's "lengthy narrative" concerning "the fatal love of Siegmund and Siegelind" must have stood in the original poem. Immediately after the heroine's rapturous greetings of Nature and him who has rewakened her thereto, she tells the youth "Dich Zarten nährt' ich noch eh' du gezeugt" etc., which Siegfried naïvely but naturally interprets as meaning that she herself must be his long-lost mother. Something in the manner of Kundry in *Parsifal*, Brünnhilde then begins, "Du wonniges Kind, deine Mutter kehrt dir nicht wieder" (*vid.* 415 *ant.*). *There* must have followed the "lengthy narrative," and with equal confidence we may therefore assume that all the passage about "Wotan's Gedanke," and Siegfried's reply that it is entirely beyond his comprehension, "da all' meine Sinne dich nur sehen und fühlen," belong exclusively to '52. With that reply of Siegfried, however, the key is pitched for the remainder of his rôle in this particular drama, that "blühende Brunst" which presents him as little more than the sense-excited male. And there may be found an explanation for the inconsistency of his remark "Noch bist du mir die träumende Maid" (p. 92) immediately following her horror-struck repulsion of his advances. If Siegfried did *not* originally press his suit with such alarming vigour, Brynhild would have had no need to flee to the other end of the stage, and his characterisation of her as still a "*dreaming*

---

brochure had not come under my notice before my chapters dealing with the RING in vol. iii. were practically completed; otherwise I should have profited by many a hint from so pithy and lucid a work. Luckily, however, I have nothing to withdraw in consequence.

maid" might have been perfectly appropriate. This I merely offer as a guide to discrimination between two several styles of treatment, whereof the later, though possibly too realistic for some tastes, is undoubtedly the more dramatic. To the earlier version would thus belong Brünnhilde's metaphor "Sah'st du dein Bild" (p. 94), a poetic embellishment the like whereof the whole RING has but one other instance, and that in the precursor to this very scene, "Schimmernde Wolken" (p. 86), where revision can never have even been contemplated. The metaphor being distinctly the *poet's* work of 1851 (there are several fine specimens in *Opera and Drama*), it would be interesting to know how it was capped by Siegfried in those days; since his present reply assuredly proclaims the *dramatist* of '52, with all the "wüthender" passion then infused into his hero's temper.—At fever heat, the next two pages must be almost purely '52 work, till we come to a surprisingly sudden cooling on p. 97, "kehrt mir zurück mein kühner Muth" etc., with its evident '51 resumption of the semi-humorous "fear" idea. Brynhild's amusement, "O kindischer Held" to "lachend muss ich dich lieben," would belong to the same earlier version; but at that point the dramatist of '52 strikes in once more, and turns the laughter raised by naïve humour into the frenzy of "lachend will ich erblinden" and so on—the dramatist who at the last moment made Wotan tell Fricka in the *Walküre* "so segne, *lachend der Liebe*" (cf. 21 *ant.*).—Finally, it is worthy of notice that in after years the *musician* cast a veil over these transports of passion through the fugal form he adopted as majestic close to this enraptured duet, (*cf.* 178*n ant.*), thus restoring it in some measure to the presumable mood of the original poem.

Page 81. ADOLF STAHR ON THE RING-POEM.—Vol. I. of the *Briefe h. Zeitgenossen an Liszt* (Breitkopf und Härtel 1895) contains that amazing letter of the democratic essayist from which I have quoted a few sentences. The following is a translation of its full text:—

"Berlin 15/3, 1853.

"My dear friend, I have just finished reading Wagner's poem. But even before I had finished, I felt it would be impossible to comply with the poet's desire and tell him my opinion of his work.

"To put it briefly, I know no other judgment on this product, than is contained in the dilemma: Either *I* am incapable of understanding or feeling what is possible, presentable and dramatically effective, what is tragic and humanly touching—or, *from beginning to end this poem is one huge failure, as colossal and gigantic as the monstrous sagas whence it sprang.* I am as firmly convinced as of my own existence, that this poem—*even* if one succeeded in overcoming all the immeasurable difficulties of its representation, even if the creator of

Tannhäuser and Lohengrin succeeded in clothing this flinty, jagged body with music (an 'if' beyond my remotest conception)—I repeat: I am as convinced as of my own existence, that even then, were any theatre to venture to perform it, the work would make the most utter fiasco. For this work Wagner would have in the *first* place to create for himself a public, and a public which should resemble the present about as little as the Siegfried of the Nibelungenlied a modern officer of the Guards.—To see a gifted man so far awry that one can scarcely extend to him even the words of Polonius: 'Though this be madness, yet there is method in it' [quoted in English] is positively lamentable. But just because I have advocated his earlier works with enthusiasm and love, because I have extolled the *poet* as well as the musician in Lohengrin and Tannhäuser,—just for that reason I have a right, nay, the duty to send him through you a word of warning entreaty to quit a path whereon, I fear, not *one* of his true friends will follow him. This poem is in *every respect* a falling-off from his whole previous manner; except that all the faults and failings of the older poems have swelled to huge proportions here, whereas the humanly fine poetic qualities have wellnigh shrunk into the background. Here is a *language* no living creature speaks, a *rhythm* and a *verse-construction* foreign to my ear; the *sense* is often difficult of understanding, even to the tranquilly attentive reader; the *speeches* long and ultra-long, the *plot* positively unintelligible to any but the learned scholar, and its whole supra- and infra-human world of beings, their motives, thinkings, dealings, fates—*uninteresting* to the last degree, nay—tiresome! The word is out; I cannot revoke it.—Heaven only knows how Wagner, instead of taking the grandly simple, humanly seizable, profoundly stirring *motives of the Nibelungenlied*, which offered him the most splendid matter for a pair of tragic music-dramas [sic], 'Siegfried's Death' and 'Chriemhild's Vengeance,' could have brewed this preposterous hotch-potch of four dramas out of the old Norse saga! He has committed precisely all the faults that, in my opinion, it was anywise possible to commit in treating this subject, without availing himself of a single one of the advantages it offered in such abundance. I beg you to read in Fried. Vischer's 'Kritische Gänge,' pages 399-436 of part II., the ground-plan of an operatic poem to be founded on the Nibelungenlied, and then tell me if it is not pitiful that so highly gifted a man, poet and artist, as Richard Wagner, should have shot a mile wide of the mark! And for that reason, as I happen to have quoted Shakespeare, I would fain see his maxim, 'Madness in great ones must not unwatch'd go!' practically applied to his [W.'s] salvation by yourself, honoured friend, and by other friends as well. Wagner himself is secretly conscious that he has done a foolhardy thing. For, no true artist has such wholesale doubt concerning his work, as he betrays by putting a manuscript-issue to *this* use.

"I will not descend to details. Indeed it is not the detail, I attack; 'tis the work in its entirety, on *every* side, for which I totally lack the organ [of comprehension]. It is your own concern, dear Liszt, more than of any other living person, that the artist whom you have hitherto championed with the whole energy of your great will-power, with the whole influence of your name, with all the nobility of your magnanimous nature, should not compromise himself before the world with a work that seems to me absolutely untenable before the forum of any kind of critical consideration. I had a presentiment of ill even from his letter of 1851 to me at Weimar—and unhappily my presentiment has now come true.

"I have been honest and open of speech with you, dear friend, and perhaps may therefore ask you to communicate in turn to me your judgment and opinion of this work. To Wagner himself I cannot write, at least not under the burden of the first impression. That I reserve for later. But should my opinion be more or less your own—as I venture to hope—nothing could do the poet so great a service as unsparing declaration of the plain unvarnished truth; and if he is still to be saved, it can only be by leaving him *not one foot of the field* on which he here has trenched. Quæ ferrum non sanat, ignis sanat, fire in the word's strictest, most unfigurative sense.

"Commending you and all of us to all good spirits, I close this letter, heartily longing to hear from you soon what you think of it.

Most faithfully your ADOLF STAHR."

In presence of such a document as this one stands aghast. Had Stahr but taken exception to this or that in the drama, as Schopenhauer did, his position would have been intelligible; but to find no single redeeming point in a work that has since won the suffrages of the whole civilised world, is absolute blindness. Nor does maturer reflection modify his verdict; for Bülow writes Liszt next December, apropos of a brief stay in Berlin: "I found Stahr a trifle bilious. To him and his companion [Fanny Lewald] 'The Nibelungen' is the height of the monstrous and absurd." With such a condemnation there can be no arguing, or we might ask if this be the same Adolf Stahr who had ranked the Bridal-chamber scene in *Lohengrin* as "the finest product of dramatic poetry for many and many a year"? Yet there is one thing it proves, besides the critic's lack of prescience, namely the complete *originality* of Wagner's work: so new was it, that every one of the old standards broke down when applied to it. And that is the only meaning I can read into Stahr's allusion to the letter of 1851 (see vol. iii, pp. 491 et seq.).

Page 86. SCHOPENHAUER'S PRIVATE COPY OF THE RING-POEM.—In cap. II. I have quoted the principal comments made by the sage of Frankfort on his presentation-copy of the first edition of the RING.

Here I propose to give a systematic schedule, as the details have never been fully placed on record hitherto. The reader will naturally ask for my credentials; wherefore I may state that I had the opportunity of personally inspecting this literary curiosity in 1896, when the late M. Alfred Bovet, a well-known Wagnerian and collector of rare autographs, obligingly brought it to Bayreuth for that purpose. Into an ordinary textbook I there and then transcribed in red ink each single sign of Schopenhauer's, in black ink all the author's variants, so that I now can literally speak from the book.

On the cover of the original brochure stands "Arthur Schopenhauer," in the philosopher's bold and unmistakable characters. Wagner has not signed his name at all, but written "Aus Verehrung und Dankbarkeit" on the first page, as quoted by Schopenhauer in his letter to Frauenstädt. The question of authenticity thus is placed beyond all cavil. There only remains to say, that all Schopenhauer's notes are made in fat black pencil.

One word as to my own procedure. Instead of the pagination of the original edition—inaccessible to all but a privileged few—my references to page-numbers will be in terms of the ordinary textbook. Moreover, to avoid the necessity of constant repetition, wherever I italicise a word from the text, the reader is begged to interpret those italics as representing a simple underline by Schopenhauer. Now to business:—

Das Rheingold bears no note of any kind before page 38 (textbook), where a vertical line is drawn parallel to the verses "alt und grau . . . der Götter Stamm"; undoubtedly a sign of approval.

P. 43, line 7 from foot, a misprint "wie" is corrected by crossing out the "e" and writing "r" on the margin. This clerical correction, however, may be due to some purchaser of the copy (prior to M. Bovet) who has been Vandal enough to pencil two or three amendments in accord with the later editions—which Schopenhauer *could* not have done, as he was in his grave by then. The few pencillings of this unknown Goth, distinguishable by their fainter colour and tamer stroke, I shall neglect in future.

P. 60, line 3 from bottom, the "s" of "sehre" is struck through, and replaced on the margin by a "z"—the first of Schopenhauer's quarrels with Wagner's diction.

P. 67, in the long stage-direction, "wird Wodan plötzlich Erda sichtbar" is underlined, and queried; as if the philosopher did not find the situation clearly enough expressed by that order of the proper names, in the absence of prepositions.

P. 68: "Drei der Töchter *ur-erschaff'ne, gebar mein Schoss*," queried by sign. The point, of course, is whether an "*ur*-created" being can be *born* by another. On the other hand, "was ich sehe, sagen dir nächtlich die Nornen" is marked with two vertical approving lines.

Wodan's "*Geheimniss-hehr*," however, is queried by sign : the first compound word to which Schopenhauer demurs.

P. 71 : "die des *Gebieters* gastlich *bergend* nun harrt." Small points like this I need not discuss, but simply record.—There are no other signs in the prologue.

Die Walküre. Page 7, "nimmer *floh'* ich *dem* Feind," with the elided prefix "ent" written on the margin. Five lines lower, "*Gewitter-Brunst*" ; somebody (that Goth aforesaid?) has rubbed out the mark of interrogation still to be detected.

P. 12 : "in Flucht durch den Wald trieb sie das Wild," queried by sign. Rather an obtuse query, as the sense is perfectly plain, if unexpected : "the quarry," i.e. the two "Wolfs," Wälse and Siegmund, "put the hunters to flight."

P. 16 : to "leuchtet ein Blitz" is prefixed "er-" by Schopenhauer.

Pp. 18-22 : the comments noted in cap. II. "Man kann ein Mal die Moral vergessen : aber man soll sie nicht maulschelliren."—written across the top of the two corresponding pages (42 and 43) of the original edition. A loop is drawn, including with Sieglinde's "fänd' ich den heiligen Freund, umfing' den Helden mein Arm !" the English words "Go, and murder my husband." In the stage-direction, "Sie hängt sich entzückt *an seinen Hals*" etc.—a simple underline. Finally, at the bottom of pages 42-3 of the original edition (which end with Sieglinde's "in den Schläfen der Adern") "Es ist infam !" is inscribed in extra large and vigorous characters. N.B.—Translations of these and the other German comments will be found in the body of cap. II. *antea*.

P. 26 : after the stage-direction "Der Vorhang fällt schnell," Schopenhauer has written "Denn es ist hohe Zeit."

P. 33 : against Fricka's "Der dir als Herren etc." stands "Wodan unterm Pantofel."

P. 34 : just before Wodan's "Nimm den Eid !" his name is followed by the comment "kauert und gehorcht."

P. 36 : "meines Willens haltenden Haft" is underlined exactly in this fashion, and queried on the margin. Once I fancied this query had something to do with "the Will" ; but I now perceive that it is a mere question of declension, since the word "Haft" is either masculine or neuter according to taste.

P. 37, line 3 : "*gehrt'* ich nach Minne" ; "zu wissen *begehrt' es* den Gott" ; and "zwang ich die *Wala*."—"Kunde empfing ich von ihr ; von mir doch empfing sie ein Kind" (the original reading) is marked with a vertical line close to the text, as if Schopenhauer at first approved of it ; but a little farther to the left a note of exclamation is added, probably due to the underlined verses that follow : "Mit *acht Schwestern* zog ich dich auf : durch *euch Walküren*" etc., p. 38. Evidently S. was astonished by a mystery that has never been authoritatively cleared up : namely, that of the parentage of Brynhild's "eight sisters."

P. 38 also bears a cross-reference. Against "die durch trüber Verträge trügende Bande" is written "158," i.e. p. 85 of *Götterdämmerung*, where we shall find "nicht trüber Verträge trügender Bund" similarly annotated with "51," i.e. the present p. 38 of *Die Walküre*.

P. 50: Brünnhilde's "*sehrenden* Blick."

P. 56. In the first stage-direction, "*gewahrt*." In the second, "und *diesen mit dem Schilde deckend*"; Brünnhilde's two verses, "Triff' ihn, Siegmund! traue dem Siegschwert!" are bracketed; and the margin bears a quotation from *Faust*, "Stosst Ihr nur immer, ich parire!"

P. 57. In the stage-directions that introduce act iii, "Tannenwald," "Felshöle," "Felssteine," "Felsensaume" and "Felsspitze," are all underlined, and adorned respectively with the exclamations "So!" "Ohren! Ohren!" "So!" "Ohren!" and "er hat keinen Ohren! der taube Musikant."

P. 58. Three times over in the stage-directions a Schopenhauerian "?" follows the word "Tann," on account of its not being rounded off with the optional "e."

P. 60. In the stage-directions "Felssaume" is underlined, though the critic had previously objected to the alternative form, viz. "Felsensaume" (p. 57). "Wolkenzuge" is another compound underlined; it is further adorned with a "So!"; whilst the top of the page bears the comment "Die Wolken spielen die Hauptrolle."

P. 61: "*Felsspitze*" objected to in a stage-direction, with "Ohren!" written on the margin.

P. 64. "*Siegmund's Schwester und Braut*," underlined in mild continuation of the protest against the closing scene of act i.

P. 66. "Nicht *sehre* dich Sorge um mich," and "*ein Wälsung wächst dir im Schosse*"; the latter demur obviously connected with the said protest.

P. 67: "an mir *zögr' ich den* Zürnenden hier" notifies an objection to the unorthodox transitive use of the verb "zögern."

P. 75. In Brünnhilde's pleading, "*schweige den Zorn*" is underlined, and at top of the page is written "Die Sprache muss das *Leibeigen* des Herrn seyn."

P. 76. A large note of interrogation is drawn against Brünnhilde's "Weil für dich im Auge . . . rathlos den Rücken du wandtest." The reason of the query is not apparent, unless it be that Schopenhauer found some initial difficulty in understanding "the one" and "the other." Further course of this scene must have cleared that difficulty; for he raises no other objection to the contents.

P. 80: "fern *mich verzieh'n*." In later editions Wagner himself has amended this into "fern von dir zieh'n."

P. 84: "*wabernde* Lohe"; though the derivation from the old "Waber-Lohe" might easily have occurred to the critic.

Der junge Siegfried.—Here we begin with an "Ohr!" written against the "*Felsstücken*" of the opening stage-directions. "Müh' ohne *Zweck*"—"Lohn," i.e. "wage" or "reward," is marginally proposed by Schopenhauer. Personally, I prefer Wagner's "Zweck," i.e. "toil without aim," or "end."

P. 6. "Wenn Siegfried *sehrend* ihn schwingt." Again that "Lohn" is suggested in lieu of the underlined "Zweck," in the repetition of "Muh' ohne Zweck!"

P. 10. "Als *zullendes* Kind . . . wärmte mit *Kleiden*." The more usual forms would be "zulpendes"—a very ugly sound—and "Kleidern."

P. 11. A query against each of the elliptic expressions, "wie kommt das, kehr' ich zurück?" and "wie kommt das nun, kehr' ich zurück?"

P. 13. "The welps" against Siegfried's "die *Welpen*"; "zullende" and "Kleiden" again underlined.

P. 14. Against the lad's "doch kroch nie *ein Fisch aus der Kröte*" is written "doch!" We are left in uncertainty as to whether Schopenhauer deemed it possible that Evolution might turn descendants of toads into fish, or merely ironised the bare suggestion, even in its form of a denial.

P. 16: "zullendes" underlined for the third time.

Pp. 16-19. In the 1853 edition page 81 begins with Mime's "Entfiel er mir wohl?" (of the present p. 16) and ends three lines after his "Halte! halte! wohin?" (present p. 19). At its top is inscribed by Schopenhauer "Empörender Undank. Maulschellirte Moral." We cannot connect this reproof, however, with Siegfried's present bodily menace, since no personal threat was contained in this part of the original issue. The "revolting ingratitude" is evidently levelled against Siegfried's declaration that, once launched on the world, he will never return to his rearer; for Schopenhauer's pencil makes a savage dash at the end of "nie wieder zu seh'n!" (p. 19 textbook). "Dir glaub' ich nicht mit dem Ohr', dir glaub' ich nur mit dem Aug'" (p. 17), on the other hand, is apparently approved, if we may judge by a vertical line at its side.

It will be remembered that in the first edition the greater part of the Fear episode, differing entirely from its ultimate form, occurs after Mime's "Halte! halte! wohin?" (p. 421 *ant.*). Here, also, Schopenhauer has indulged in a few notes.—In place of "*Thör'gen*" he suggests "Thörichten." For "Die List ist es, die Furcht uns lehrt," he proposes by means of a serpentine curve "Die Furcht ist es, die List uns lehrt"; but Wagner is right, as the words form no independent assertion, but an *answer* to Siegfried's "Das, Mime, wäre das Fürchten?"—consequently the "es" refers to the "Das" of that question. Later, the objector queries "Denn scheid' ich das Fürchten zu lernen, dich lehr' ich das Fegen zuvor"—"An I quit you to learn about fearing, I'll teach you what thrashing is first"—presumably

for the "ingratitude" reason. On the contrary, Mime's "Verfluchte Brut aus der Menschen Brunst" ("accursed brood from the rut of men") is countersigned with a vertical mark of approval by the arraigner of the Will-to-live as prime agent in the sexual act. Finally, "den *Huien*" is underlined: it is a good word nevertheless, however unusual in German; we possess its analogue in our own expressive "hobbledehoy," perhaps in "hoiden."

Pp. 22-3. The first three verses of each of the Wanderer's answers to Mime's riddles are marked with a vertical line on the margin. Evidently the strophic parallel appealed to the critic's sense of form.

P. 24. For "*den Haft* der Welt" Schopenhauer suggests "Das Heft." In "dess' empfah' ich jetzt deines zum Pfand" (the original version) he underlines "deines" and corrects its "s" into "n." Here Wagner seems to have forgotten that the pronoun refers to "Kopf," the gender of which is masculine, unless it be simply a printer's error.

P. 29. "Dort bricht's durch den Wald": a cross-reference "94" (i.e. p. 43 of the textbook) reminds us that the expression is repeated by Alberich at the opening of act ii. Even a stronger proof of attentive reading, than the "trüber Verträge" already-cited.

P. 43. In addition to the cross-reference aforesaid (here "88"), notice is taken of "Links *gewahrt* man . . . *Felsenwand*," and again "*Felsenwand*," in the stage-directions; which are accordingly provided with a hypercritical "So!?"

P. 46: "doch *sorgt er mich* nicht."

P. 48. Fafner's "Ich lieg' und besitze" elicits from Schopenhauer "1848"—a political allusion.

P. 49. Two vertical lines approve "Alles ist nach seiner Art: an ihr wirst du nichts wandeln" (the original wording).

P. 51: "soll das *etwa* Fürchten heissen?"

P. 53. "Nach *freislichem* Streit" is queried.

P. 56. In the stage-direction concerning Fafner, "in der Gestalt eines ungeheuren *eidechsenartigen Schlangen*wurmes" calls forth a note of exclamation, though the problem in morphology is nothing like so hard as that presented by mythologic combinations in the classics. A "lizard-like serpent" is by no means inconceivable; in fact modern Zoology knows the German term "Schlangeneidechse" for the Seps or "serpent-lizard." A dinosaur or iguanodon would probably represent Wagner's idea of Fafner the "Wurm."

P. 73. In the stage-directions at the beginning of act iii "*Felsenberges*" evokes the cry "* al solito;" which really rebounds on the critic. Otherwise this act is left to take its course in peace.

Siegfried's Tod, the present *Götterdämmerung*, is as little annotated as *Das Rheingold*. The following are the only comments here:—

P. 17. Under the last word of Hagen's "Keinem and'ren wiche die Brunst" the sage has written "Feuer," apparently objecting to the association of ideas connected with "heat."

P. 20. Siegfried's "nun ficht mit mir, oder sei mein Freund!" calls forth three big exclamation-marks.

P. 35: a "*Felsstein*" in the stage-directions—the old rock of offence.

P. 61: "*Allrauner*" (our friend of 1849—see p. 49 *ant.*).

P. 82. The heroine's "Sein Ross führet daher . . . vollbringt Brünnhilde's Wunsch" is marked by Schopenhauer with a vertical line to the left, "Suttee" to the right. The vertical line suggests approval; the "Suttee" may be meant to revoke it.

P. 83. A query is set against "dass wissend würde ein Weib," as if the philosopher considered there might be better methods of conducting a woman to "wisdom." Or is it that he doubted her being able to attain it at all? The question must remain open, as indeed must that of the appropriateness of this verse of Wagner's to its juxtaposition.

P. 85 bears the cross-reference already mentioned, "51" (i.e. *W.* 38) being set against "trüber Verträge etc."

P. 86 winds up the puristic objections with an underlined "Scheithaufen."

The above are positively all the annotations made by Schopenhauer on his private copy of the Ring-poem. One could wish they had been more illuminating, but must take them as one finds them.

Page 90 *n.* BETTINA, THE GRIMMS, AND THE RING-POEM.—Bettina von Arnim, notorious lion-huntress (Beethoven, Goethe et al.), had spent the latter part of 1852 in Weimar (304 *ant.*). About the end of February '53 Liszt would appear to have sent to her, then back in Berlin, a copy of Wagner's new poem with a good-natured request to submit it to the famous Brothers Grimm. March 19 she replies:—

"I have no relations whatever with the two Grimms; for many years I have learnt to avoid their house, and therefore have no influence over them; moreover, my friends ["*man*"—probably Stahr] do not think it advisable to commend the text of this musical deluge, which may bear with it many a wild billow, to two scholars whose conscientious spirit of research might take offence at every syllable.

"People here account for the Tannhäuser stipulations as the tyranny of a democrat of anno 48, and see therein a spectre whose gigantic terrorism apes Rameau's doubtful merits . . . Lemures (night-ghosts, larvæ) ever haunt the confines of their Manes. Rameau's disciples deluged France with bad music, on all sides, at expense of

their master; and there will be insects enough begotten now, to swarm round Rameau's lemur.—I do not know if you remember, Liszt, my warning to let these Lemur poems be, so long as they do not molest you; but yourself to proceed any farther on their road, should be forbidden to your originality by their *too narrow bounds!*— —eh! too narrow are these bounds, for a single germ of direct originality to find a place within them . . . It is your dream of being in duty bound to bring about the Loftiest, the Unsurpassable, the All-embracing, that has finally cast you into the arms of this lemur of Rameau, and made you shield-bearer to the larva of an already *defunct* whose utmost merit it was to break through the small circle of still smaller music and raise the Lyric above the common boards. That service is no longer needed. . . .

"Nevertheless I have proposed to the two sons of Grimm,* to hand them [evidently the two elder Grimms] the Nibelungen-text on your behalf. They have declined, and assured me that no good result could be expected, even had they the time to devote to it, which they have not. Nor would I like any harm to accrue from it, as your zeal for your friend has at least something sacred about it, something far finer than the cause in which it is exerted" (*Br. h. Z. an F. L.* I.).

It is distinctly amusing, to see Bettina riding the high horse over Wagner's big poem in a letter stuffed with the wildest balderdash, metaphors gone mad, and absolutely unintelligible aphorisms. Only a sentence here and there have I found it possible even to paraphrase, as the sense (?) is left in the most slovenly state of incompleteness. Yet, apart from the allusions to the Brothers Grimm—whom Wagner held in such high honour—this citation may serve to shew the kind of intellectual surroundings with which Liszt had to contend in his "shield-bearing" for his friend. In one sense both Stahr and Bettina were right: the Ring-poem *had* appeared a generation before its public, and six months after that appearance the author himself writes thus to friend Schindelmeisser (Aug. 13, '53):—

"As regards my new poem, 'der Ring des Nibelungen,' I terribly repent now of having had 50 copies of it printed—and for my hard cash too. It is not merely that I have been *unable* to prevent the book falling into the hands of utter outsiders (*gänzlich Unberufener*), but even for my friends—as I now feel—this poem ought to have been practically non-existent before its musical completion, and I might almost say, performance. I now see more and more that what I have in hand is something one can *do*, but must not speak or let be spoken of. Whereas, when a man has a poem submitted to him, he ought to think of nothing but that poem and its subject, people insist upon

* Presumably of W. Grimm, as his son Hermann subsequently married Bettina's daughter Gisela.

dwelling on the purely technical question of its presumable musical execution ; just as if poems of this sort had their sole origin in a wish to furnish the ordinary opera-composer with matter for his musical emissions, instead of their having their reason and necessity within themselves, in the life and intuitions of the poet, and consequently bringing the musician the new matter for which and through which he has to discover a new music—i.e. a type of music alone-adapted to that matter. Therefore, if the musical (as also the scenic) execution is necessarily still my secret, which I cannot reveal till everything is ready, nothing can be more painful to me than to be obliged to hear others discussing—and that at last in public—this artistic secret of my inner man.—In short, I wish I could call-in every copy I have made away. Come to me soon, and I will *read* it to you, perhaps *sing* whatever is finished, and *speak* with you about it :—then you shall also take a copy home with you, if you want one ! But the other way I would rather contribute nothing to the multiplication of —misunderstandings that distress me.—Please don't interpret this wrongly ! "

Bear in mind the date of this letter, and you will perhaps endorse my estimate of pages 80 and 82 *ant.* concerning certain of the poem's readers.

P. 131. WAGNER'S PIANOFORTE WORKS (cf. 185).—The original title of what is now known as the "Album-Sonata" was simply "Sonate für Mathilde Wesendonck," without the predicate "Album," which latter is really inappropriate for a work covering 16 pages and comprising 258 bars. Its manuscript further bears a motto adapted from the Norns' scene by change of singular to plural (or rather, *dual* here), "*Wisst Ihr wie das wird ?*"—"Know ye what will come of it ?" Though written years before that memorable 'catastrophe' the true nature of which has recently been set before the world in its authentic light, this motto had been pounced on by the gobemouches as an omen of ill. But the sonata was sent to the husband himself June 20, 1853, for presentation to his wife, "my first composition since the completion of Lohengrin" : the composer has just been accommodated by Herr Otto with a friendly loan, and sends this composition as half-playful warrant that he can "pay an old debt." Coupling that with his remarks of nine days previously, "After a five-year pause in music-making I need to regain the youthful courage to set about my new gigantic task," and three weeks after, "ruled paper is all in readiness" for composition of *Rheingold* (155 *ant.*), the motto's meaning is clear : Has my right hand lost its cunning ?

If the answer rested on this Sonata alone, it would have to be equivocal. There are many beauties in the work, yet one cannot but feel that the medium is ill-chosen, a medium not of the composer's

choice. I see that the Sonata (A flat *) has recently been transcribed for full orchestra : that I deem flying to the other extreme ; it is distinctly chamber-music, although requiring 'strings,' especially in a passage marked "*wie gesungen*" ("as if sung") at bottom of p. 4. Consequently I would suggest a string quartet or quintet as more in keeping with the author's inner conception. Even the cadenza in contrary motion, p. 16—a favourite trick of the 'classical' pfte school—is strictly an offspring of that type of musical thought which thinks in different 'voices' : when those voices are actually of different timbre, taken by different individualities, they give us the idea of two distinct entities meeting and parting ; rendered on the one instrument they give us the uncomfortable feeling that the pfte is alternately contracting and expanding, with the uncanny effect of that terror of one's childhood, the magic-lantern chromotrope.

The form of this Sonata in A flat is perhaps unique, for not only is it written in a single movement, but that movement offers none of the usual landmarks of sonata-form : e.g. there is not the smallest pretence of repeating a first section, whilst the two principal subjects are 'worked out' precisely as and when the composer pleases ; a form well enough defined in itself, and perfectly logical, but scarcely that of even the freest-treated 'sonata.' Singular, too, is the fact that this freedom of form is allied to somewhat traditional contents, as if the composer were bent on proving the 'classic' spirit a thing quite independent of the classic mould. Were this "Album-Sonata" suddenly sprung on you as a newly-discovered MS. of Beethoven's, you would accept it at once as a free fantasia from his so-called second period ; so steeped was the composer of *Das Rheingold* in the works of his great forerunner. In the same key as Beethoven's op. 26, the Funeral-march sonata, Wagner's first principal subject has a strong family likeness to the older master's theme with variations ; whereas the climax attained on pages 10 to 11 of this "Album-Sonata" reminds us of the climax and cadenza in the last movement of Beethoven's "Moonlight," op. 27 bis.

Oddly enough, a portion of the second chief subject in the "Album-Sonata" is repeated fairly often in the *Album-Blatt* written for Frau Betty Schott nearly twenty years after (1872, pubd 1876) :

* Tappert speaks of a still unpublished pfte Sonata in A major, in addition to the above and the early Sonata in B flat, but gives no hint of its period : presumably it is a still earlier work, that mentioned on p. 102 of my vol. i.

Probably this is an actual, though involuntary transference of idea from an earlier to a later work. Page 15 of the sonata will shew us what appears to be an inverse process :

There you cannot fail to recognise an echo from the flowing second subject of the *Kaisermarsch* (1871). Its occurrence in the "Album-Sonata" presumably is due to a slight revision prior to publication in 1877, that unspecified "later redaction" referred-to by Frau Wesendonck, when Wagner "struck out the motto." As we have seen in other cases, his revisions were almost always directed to the peroration of a work : here I should judge that the twelve bars commencing *a tempo f* p. 15, and finishing with the fermata at top of p. 16, are the fruit, possibly the whole fruit, of the said "redaction" ; certainly they constitute the gem of the work.

Beyond this Sonata in A flat and the Albumblatt in E flat (ded. to Fr. B. Schott), the following are the only other known pfte pieces of the riper Wagner :—a tiny Ländler in E flat written for the album of Frau Wesendonk's sister *ca* 1857 under the title "Züricher Vielliebchen-Walzer" (pubd *Die Musik*, "Bayreuth-number" 1901) ; an Albumblatt in C, dedicated 1861 to Pss Metternich, published by Fritzsch ten years later, and made famous through Wilhelmj's rendering on the violin ; and last, but by no means least, a work scarcely known as yet in England, the beautiful Albumblatt in A flat, dedicated also 1861 to the Countess Pourtalès, wife of the Prussian Ambassador to the French court at that time, but not published till 1897 (Fritzsch). Than the work last-named, brief as it is (78 bars), I know no pfte composition more expressive, and I earnestly recommend it even to the most moderately proficient player who has any soul : a worthy pendant to the *Fünf Gedichte*, it proves that Wagner could easily have enriched the literature of the pianoforte, had he but cared to devote attention to its special modern technique ; though it is in the title "*Ankunft bei den schwarzen Schwänen*"—"Arrival at the house of the black swans"—that we must seek this piece's inspiration. To that I must return when we reach the stormy days of the Paris defeat.

Meanwhile I want to help rescue from undeserved oblivion the pfte works of Wagner's youth. Tappert speaks of a manuscript Fantasia

in F sharp minor as being "far more interesting and characteristic than the Sonata and Polonaise" of the same period (i, 126); whilst Dorn has told us that "it would be impossible to detect in this sterile sonata a single trace of its extraordinary predecessor, that amazing overture with the big drum" (*ibid.*). Those comparisons we are in no position to verify; but anyone with eyes and fingers may convince himself that the said early Sonata and Polonaise are far from being either sterile or void of interest. They were published Easter 1832 by Breitkopf and Härtel, as Wagner's op. 1 and 2, and are still on the market: thoroughly 'grateful' pieces for the instrument, not in the least difficult, but characterised at a glance by remarkable 'go.' The Polonaise is clearly a picture from the life, since it was in January 1832 that the exiled Poles began to pour through Leipzig, rousing the lad's warmest enthusiasm (i, 130). Take its first 4 bars, and hear for yourselves how he has caught the national spirit:

The inflection at the close of this example is so little un-characteristic of Richard Wagner, that we meet it again in *Rienzi* act ii, opening of scene 3. Moreover, the whole swing of the piece shews that virile sense of *rhythm* which is the main secret of Wagner's hold on the concert-public of our day. Study it for yourself, dear reader, in the more serviceable form in which it is now available, a pfte solo instead of the original duet; and remember that it was not written as a salon-piece, but obviously for dancing to.

Its companion, or rather its immediate predecessor in actual point of composition, simply teems with interest, both musical and biographic. Whenever you read in criticisms of the next half-century that Wagner is "an amateur musician, ignorant of the laws of harmony, counterpoint" and all the rest of it, refer to this Sonata in B flat, written at the age of eighteen, after but six months' regular tuition, at the end whereof good cantor Weinlig (to whom it is dedicated) dismissed him with the commendation, "What it was in my power to teach the youth, he already knows wellnigh of himself" (i, 124). All the mysteries of sonata-form have been mastered, all its rules observed, and yet the work is so remote from a mere exercise to order, that it positively brims with exuberant life. Here you have the first and fourth movements duly built to the regulation pattern,

repeat, working-out and recapitulation, with full use of every opportunity offered by the subjects in the way of inversion, counterpoint and modulation. The first subject of movement 1, *Allegro con brio*, is somewhat trite, no doubt; but we can imagine the teacher's injunction to choose a theme that would lend itself well to development, and certainly its developments are full of individuality; individual is even the quaint bob wherewith the key makes its first bow to the hearer, in a succession of detached fundamental chords—you are put in a good humour to start with. Most graceful is the second subject of this first movement, which I will quote in one of its derivatives:

Grace also is the characteristic of the *Menuetto*, third movement; Mozart or Haydn might have written it, yet it stands on its own feet. What neither of those masters would have ventured to introduce into a sonata, I think, is the second subject of movement 4, *Allegro vivace*, with its recklessness of the conventionalities:

A good rousing *tune*, such as Weber would have loved, and such as we can fancy Wagner's fellow-students marching to, on some gay expedition. A youngster who could write a thing like that, not caring for head-shakings of the puritanical, must have had plenty of grit in him, besides his animal spirits. Then see how cleverly he pulls it up short against the first subject (bass) and an inversion thereof:



This fourth movement, in fact, is not only replete with originality of material, but also a triumph of constructive ingenuity, for a further instance whereof I merely refer you to the fugal treatment of its first subject, culminating in a 'canon at the ninth above,' which is led step by step up to the octave. From beginning to end, the thing is alive; and that is the main difficulty with a work written to rule—what Nietzsche calls "dancing in fetters."

If movements 1, 3 and 4 shew the lad in all the various phases of a natural animation, the *Larghetto*, movement 2, reveals the deeper feeling in him. Its flavour is essentially Beethovenian, and the theme reminds one of the Adagio in Beethoven's op. 2, 1; but I make bold to say that the young Wagner here has beaten the slightly older Beethoven on his own domain, for there is scarcely a grain of sentimentality in our hero's work; here nothing is pumped up, the pathos is as free from mannerism as the gaiety in the other movements. I quote the main theme in the lovely tint it takes towards the end, and follow it with a passionate episode from its earlier development:



To compare this work with Mozart's or Mendelssohn's products at a similar age, is to forget that those masters died young, and that Nature therefore brought them early to maturity; also, that they had been bred to music from their childhood, whereas young Richard was merely starting on the path. Set it beside Beethoven's creations at any age under twenty, and—allowing for Wagner's having had the riper, or at least the 'second period' Beethoven to look to as model—I believe the younger master need shrink from no comparison.

Pages 148-50. ALBERT AND JOHANNA WAGNER.—To understand the embroglio that deprived London of the opportunity of hearing Richard Wagner's niece at the height of her vocal power, owing to her father's over-reaching greed, we must first realise the mutual position of the two English impresarios who entered into contracts with, and litigation over, the shifty pair. Of Benjamin Lumley *Grove's Dict. of Music* tells us that, "born in 1812, he was bred to the law, and in Nov. 1832 admitted a solicitor. Being concerned for Laporte he became mixed up with the affairs of the Opera [Her Majesty's Theatre], and on Laporte's death in 1841 was induced to become its manager. Pursuing a policy initiated by his predecessor, he gave prominence to the ballet to the neglect of the opera, and in a few years had so alienated his performers that at the end of the season of 1846 nearly

the whole of his principal singers, band, and chorus, seceded and joined the newly formed establishment at Covent Garden. The popularity of Jenny Lind sustained him during the next three seasons; and after her retirement from the stage in 1849, the return of Sontag to public life enabled him to maintain his position for a time, but afterwards the fortune of the house waned, until, at the end of the season of 1852, the manager was compelled to close the theatre until 1856, when the burning of Covent Garden induced him again to try his fortune. He struggled on for three seasons, but at the end of 1858 was forced to submit. . . . After his retirement he returned to his original profession. In 1864 he published an account of his managerial career, under the title of 'Reminiscences of the Opera.'" In *Grove* we also read: "Between 1826 and 46 operas and musical dramas were from time to time played at Covent Garden. But it was not until 46 that the theatre was turned permanently into an opera-house; when, with the interior reconstructed by Mr. Albano, it was opened, in the words of the prospectus, 'for a more perfect representation of the lyric drama than has yet been attained in this country.' . . In the company were included Madame Grisi and Signor Mario, who with Signor Costa and nearly all the members of his orchestra had suddenly left Her Majesty's Theatre for the new enterprise, in which they were joined by Mme. Persiani, Signor Tamburini, Signor Ronconi, and Mlle. Alboni, who, on the opening night—April 6, 47—sang (as Arsace in 'Semiramide') for the first time on this side of the Alps. The management of the Royal Italian Opera, as the new musical theatre was called, passed after a short time into the hands of Mr. Delafield, who was aided by Mr. [Frederick] Gye; and since Mr. Delafield's bankruptcy the establishment has been carried on solely by Mr. Gye (1851), who, when the theatre was burned down in 1856, rebuilt it at his own expense" (handing it over to his son Ernest, husband of Mme. Albani, in 1877).

A war to the knife had thus been waged for several years between the rival managers of two operatic undertakings, each of which was on the brink of bankruptcy just before the hapless Johanna came their way. Alike Lumley and Gye were on the alert to snap up the latest attraction, whether opera or singer, and it was enough that one of them should hear of the other's advances, for him promptly to seek to secure the prize himself. For some time papa and daughter Wagner seem to have wavered between the two rivals, for this is what a Dr Bacher, brother-in-law to the Paris music-publisher Brandus, swears at one of the numerous trials to be presently mentioned (the Queen's Bench one): "I am a native of Germany, and a doctor of civil law of Vienna. In the year 1850 Miss Wagner brought to me letters of introduction at Vienna. Before that I was on terms of intimate friendship with Meyerbeer. So was Miss Wagner. I was about to leave Vienna for

Paris, and she obliged me by singing in private. I found she had a splendid voice, and great dramatic expression. I recommended her to go to London and Paris. She was accompanied by her father. He transacts business for her. . . . I saw Miss Wagner in July 1850, and saw Mr. Lumley about her soon after. I recommended him to engage her. He did not do so at that time. He did not know of her talent. . . Miss Wagner wrote to me a letter on the 3rd of October [1851], to say that Mr. Gye and Mr. Lumley had [each] made her an offer. I told her it would be much better for her to come out at Mr. Lumley's theatre. . . Mr. Wagner told me Mr. Gye offered more than Mr. Lumley. I told him she would not lose. After that she signed the contract" (with Lumley, Nov. 9, '51, for £1200, *vid. inf.*).

Quite touching are Johanna's letters to this intermediary. Aug. 18, 51, she writes, among other things, "You are an excellent man, that all must allow, and during the whole of my life I should not wish a better chargé d'affaires than Dr. Bacher. You could not manage your own business better. A thousand thanks for the kind interest you take in me, my dearest friend. I only wish I were as clever in every respect as you think me. To undeceive you, would be terrible for both. . . . Have you written to Papa a letter to Dobesan [Roqueplan?] similar to the one you wrote to me, as you promised to do? All the rest concerning money matters I leave entirely to you. You will manage them better than anybody else for your child. You must be indulgent as this letter is so long. I feel quite startled at its length. . . I should like to press hands most thankfully for your kindness."* Rather a gushing young lady, but her unconcern about "money matters" is presumably genuine, as Albert took more than a fatherly care for them, and "papa has answered your letter through Breslau," papa being absent from Berlin at the time, perhaps looking after Francisca's shekels. For dear papa is not so childlike: when Bacher proceeded to Berlin in November 51, with Lumley's usual printed form of agreement, papa objected to it as "too complicated," and drew one up himself, which *he and* his daughter signed on the 9th, a contract omitting the customary stipulation that she was not to sing anywhere else in public, during this London engagement, without Lumley's written consent. The stipulation was of course re-inserted by Lumley before *he* signed and forwarded the counterpart to Johanna, who acknowledges receipt Nov. 27 to Bacher with "best thanks. All

* The full (translated) text of this and the following letter, forming part of the evidence in the Chancery action, will be found in the *Times* of May 10, 52. Since Lumley was then managing the Italian opera in Paris, the letter of August appears to refer to that; most certainly does the clause about Roqueplan in that of the following November; yet I can discover no positive statement anywhere that Johanna ever actually sang to the Paris public.

is in the best order. . . Is there any chance of your coming to Berlin before you return to Vienna? If you could manage it, it would be a source of great comfort [?] to Your much obliged Joanna Wagner.—Pray make my compliments to both the directors, Messrs Lumley and Roqueplan."

Alas for gushing protestations of eternal friendship! That letter has scarcely reached its destination, than papa-ruled Johanna sends Gye a still more affecting message, Dec. 7: "I must naturally appear ungrateful to you; but we have told you again and again the peculiar reasons which compel me for this once to sing at Mr. Lumley's against my feelings; you know them well. I expect little good from this engagement; but, on my word, I could not act otherwise. I am very unhappy about it—I and especially my father, who expects nothing but evil from this connexion. Nevertheless, I hope for your pardon, and even that you will receive us in London as friends. Will you not, Monsieur? In this hope, we anticipate with pleasure seeing you again. A thousand compliments from all our family.—From your devoted [?] J. Wagner." Gye's reply of the 9th Jan., 52, is immaterial, save that it ends with "a thousand compliments to your amiable family. Yours entirely devoted, F. Gye" (presumably in French, but this is his own translation).

To explain Albert and Johanna's intimacy with a rival impresario at the very time they were showering compliments on Lumley's champion, I must draw on Gye's evidence at the Queen's Bench trial:* "I first saw Miss Wagner in the year 1845. I then heard her sing at Dresden [under her uncle; perhaps even in *Tannhäuser?*]. I had no personal communication with her. I had my first interview with her at the end of 1850, or the beginning of 1851. That was at Hamburg. We came to no arrangement at that time. She mentioned an engagement at Berlin which prevented. I had two or three interviews. She ultimately declined. These letters are from Miss Wagner. In one of them she begs me not entirely to forget her name next year, and requested me to make a proposition before November 1, 1851. My opera season terminates in August. In September, 1851, I went abroad and saw Miss Wagner at Berlin, with her father. I made her proposals for 1852. The terms I offered were, I believe, £2,000—positively £2,000 for the whole season. She did not accept the proposal. I offered her £1,000 in advance. She said she would give me an answer in the end of October. I saw her again at Berlin, in the company of her father. She was not ready to give me an answer. I renewed the proposition. . . At one of those interviews they told me Dr. Bacher had been there, and they had had propositions from Mr. Lumley. No

* For this I rely on the long verbatim report in the London *Musical World*, Feb. 25, 1854.

figure was named. I think I told her I should be at Berlin again. The next communication was a letter I received from her. The letter is dated December 7, 1851 [given above, so far as printed]. I wrote in answer on the 9th of January. (Read). I went to Berlin again in the month of January. I had occasion to see Meyerbeer. I took the opportunity of calling upon Miss Wagner, and negotiated about her singing at my theatre in 1853, and for six or eight nights after the completion of her engagement with Mr. Lumley. An engagement was signed for 1853. It was not a positive engagement, but she gave me an assurance that if she did sing in England in 1853, she would sing only at my theatre. No engagement was made for 1852. I never attempted to induce her to break her engagement with Mr. Lumley. We had no further communication till the month of March following. I had heard that Mr. Lumley was in difficulties. I then wrote a letter of the 9th of March. (Read)," and so on.

We must concur with judge and jury in accepting Gye's statement that he made no attempt to influence Johanna at this period; yet his tempting offers ad futurum had begun to sap her father's satisfaction with his bargain, for this is Albert's letter to Bacher of Feb. 21, '52—a letter rousing both mirth and resentment when read that April to the Court of Chancery in its doubtless bald translation: *

ALBERT WAGNER TO BACHER.—"Dear Friend,—You would wait long for a letter from Joanna. I myself do not know whether you, wandering Jew, are now in Vienna; however, I write at all events to inform you that we have sent the necessary letter to Mr. Lumley, and requested him, pro formâ, to defer once more [?] the fulfilment of the contract for a fortnight longer, which has been already settled between us. He (Mr Lumley) answered very politely, and agreed to it; however, he would have wished her to be present for a longer time at the rehearsals of 'The Prophete,' but it is impossible as everywhere [?] this time Johanna has much work to do before her journey, and it is merely a short time ago that she began studying her Italian parts, and she requires a fortnight's rest before undertaking in London another work which will require all her energy. I should otherwise bring her, check mate [?], to London, but that would not do. We shall try to be there at the appointed moment, and from Hamburgh, where she will remain at her sister's during Passion-week, she will probably leave on Easter Monday [Apr. 12]. Joanna remains [will wait?] for her debut in 'The Prophete,' being [till she is?] sure of a quiet, extreme, and sure success. They [We] prefer 'Romeo,' because they say she alone

* The original (German) is not on record. The translated text I quote from the *Times* of April 24, 52; the queries &c. within square brackets are mine.

makes Romeo. If she succeeds [in that], the people will go to the 'Prophete' for her sake alone; but they would not go for the whole of Lumley's 'Prophete,' since it is much better at Gye's; there is something [to be said] for both, but 'Tab' is preferable to 'Fid.'* That, however, in which everybody agrees, is, that we have made a very bad bargain as regards money matters; that clause pressed by you on us which prohibits us [?!] from singing at concerts, it is a real loss, especially as we are to have neither apartments nor carriage free, which have been granted to others. England is only to be valued for the sake of her money ["England rewards only by money" is the rendering of the Wagners' counsel]. I am curious to hear how your speculation is terminating. You appear to be the very man for it. Farewell! let us hear from you. Receive our best compliments, and if you wish to hear from us Joanna will tell you. A thousand compliments from Yours truly, A. WAGNER."

We need not pause to gloat over the remark about England addressed by one German to another, and never intended for publicity; that Albert himself cared for nothing save the shekels, is sufficiently clear from his repinings over the "bad bargain." That he knew how to drive a 'good' one, we shall learn in a moment; but the real point is his asking (and obtaining) an extension of time, alike logically and legally involving a deferment of the part-payment in advance which Lumley was originally to have made him on March 15. In fact Albert's own letter of March 9 to Lumley extends the time for that advance: "Will you be good enough to have the preparatory rehearsals of the 'Prophete' and leave us to profit by your consent and put off for 15 days the commencement of the engagement, so that it should begin the 16th of April and continue until the middle of July. If you send the bill of exchange, be good enough to address it either at this time to Berlin or from (dès) the 2nd of April to Hamburg to Engel & Co., Ferdinand-street, where we shall remain some time . . .".† That "dès le deuxième d'Avril" afterwards

* A splendid opening for the witticisms of the press, one writer "instinctively feeling that 'Tab' *must* be better than 'Fid.'" Substitute 'n' for 'b,' and you see that Albert prefers Tancredi, one of Johanna's crack parts, to Fidelio, so consumed is he with love of art.

† The French of these last two sentences is quoted in the *M. World:* "Si vous envoyez la lettre de change, veuillez bien l'adresser ou dans ce temps à Berlin ou dès le deuxième d'Avril à Hambourg.—Ad. 'Engel et Compagnie, Ferdinande Strasse,' où nous séjournerons quelque temps, chez notre fille et sœur dernièrement mariée." The last expression is of some little family interest, as no biographer has hitherto mentioned the fact of Albert's having another daughter besides Johanna and Francisca. Her bodily existence, however, is vouched for by Gye, in his Queen's Bench evidence: "At first I

formed a bone of contention for the lawyers, one side rendering it "from," the other "by," though the context renders it plain enough to an ordinary lay mind: If you send the money before the end of March, it will reach us at Berlin, but from the 2nd of April it will find us at Hamburg—where Albert had previously informed the intermediary that they would stay for "Passion week" (*vid. ant.*). In either case "April 2" revokes "March 15" in consideration of the inconvenience Lumley is to suffer through his star's postponing her ascension.

Meanwhile Gye had renewed his cautious blandishments, with a complimentary letter March 9 and a direct question on the 30th: "Forgive me for troubling you, but it is said here that your arrangements are not quite fixed with Mr. Lumley. Is this true?" Without allowing time for an answer (unless it were by telegraph, then available), Gye starts for Hamburg himself Apr. 2, and on the 5th induces the Wagners to sign a contract with *him*. According to his own deposition: "After the usual salutations I asked why she had not written to me? Miss Wagner said, 'In effect I am free.' Those were the first words she said. I then asked why she had not written to me? She said she had been expecting to receive a sum of money from Mr. Lumley, which she had not received. She said she had delayed answering, hoping she would receive it. She told me that, according to the contract with Mr. Lumley, he was bound to pay her £300 on the 15th of March. She then said she was free to make an engagement with me. I told her I was ready to make one. She asked the terms, and I offered her £2,000 for two months, and a month's salary in advance. This arrangement was entered into. (Read, dated the 5th of April, 1852.) I gave her a check for £1,000. I saw the agreement with Mr. Lumley, in order to be satisfied that it contained the provision about the payment of the £300. This was shown to me during the writing of the contract. No other clause was shown to me. I read the clause that the £300 was to be paid by the 15th of March. The agreement and check were then signed. Mr. Wagner said the contract was broken by Mr. Lumley by his not paying the £300. The Wagners suggested whether, according to the English law, the contract was broken. They said it was broken according to the Prussian law. I can only give the substance of what passed. I gave my opinion that there was no doubt that it was broken according to our English law. They then said, 'Would you have any objection to give us an indemnity?' I said, 'Not the least.' I gave this indemnity (read). Upon that I left Hamburg the same

found Mr. and Miss Wagner alone with her mother [April 5]. Afterwards others came in and joined in the conversation. There was Mr. Jacobi and his wife, whom I had known as Miss Wagner's sister."

night. Miss Wagner had asked me if I could not wait a day or two longer, in case Mr. Lumley should send the money? I said I could not."

One of the extraordinary points in this story, is that the Wagners should have waited so patiently, without a syllable of protest to Lumley or Bacher either by letter or telegraph, *if* they considered the contract already broken before Gye's visit. It certainly does not sound plausible, and not one of the English courts believed it, so far as concerned *them*. Doubtless those courts were influenced in their judgment of Herr Albert's slim transaction by the disingenuous letter appearing in the *Morning Post* and other London papers of April 22, 52, above his signature, with the amazing statements : "Early in March last Madlle Wagner received a letter from Mr. Gye . . . Although at the time of receipt of this letter my daughter might have taken advantage of a breach of contract, on the part of Mr. Lumley, she did not even reply to Mr. Gye's letter, but waited in the expectation of receiving a sum of money to which she was entitled by her contract with Mr. Lumley.—On the 21st of March I received a letter from Mr. Lumley from Paris, dated the 18th, to the effect that he had given the money to his agent, and that he had no doubt I had already received it. We, of course, daily expected this remittance, but none arrived.—On the 30th Mr. Gye again wrote, requesting an answer to his former letter, but in the hope, from day to day, of still receiving the stipulated sum from Mr. Lumley, no reply was even then sent to Mr. Gye.—On the 5th of this month, Mr. Gye arrived at Hamburg, and then for the first time I informed him, that, on the 15th of the preceding month, Mr. Lumley was bound to have paid my daughter the sum of £300, and that, having failed to do so, he had broken the contract, and, consequently, that she was free to enter into another engagement. . . . In addition to the circumstance of the terms of the contract having been unfulfilled, I feel compelled to mention that we had lately received information of occurrences, in connection with the position of Mr. Lumley and his theatre, which caused us great uneasiness. Under all these circumstances, my daughter signed her present engagement. . . . You will, therefore, perceive that, instead of Madlle Wagner having (as alleged) been 'hasty' in signing her engagement with Mr. Gye, *on the very day* Mr. Lumley had failed to fulfil his contract, she waited *three weeks* before doing so, and instead of the money having been tendered 'the following morning,' as stated in your paper, that more than four weeks were suffered to elapse before this was done, notwithstanding that we had on the 7th of April, despatched a formal notice to Mr. Lumley of his rupture of the contract.—I trust, sir, this explanation will convince you that, acting under the advice of myself and my family, and of several friends whom we consulted, my daughter was not only blameless in signing her present engagement with Mr. Gye,

but that she showed great consideration and forbearance towards Mr. Lumley."

Apart from the concealment of the mutual extension of time, and the consequent expansion into "three weeks" of what at the worst could only be three days (the usual 'grace'), there is another grave concealment in this manifesto. Bacher was still more "agent" of the Wagners than of Lumley, as is plainly proved not only by those letters of Johanna to him already-cited, but also by the part he had played from the beginning; it was *he* who introduced her name to an at first unwilling Lumley, and he who settled the contract with L. on her behalf—nothing could be clearer. Accordingly, when Lumley sent Bacher the money for her in the middle of March, he had actually fulfilled his part of the contract, since he had sent the stipulated sum to *the Wagners'* accredited agent. That this was the view adopted by the Court of Chancery, the sequel will shew; that it was Albert's view until it suited him to change it, is the only possible explanation of that patient waiting without the ghost of an anxious inquiry: Dr Bacher had acquainted him with receipt of the money, and had simply been asked by Johanna (according to B.'s sworn deposition, which there is no reason to doubt) to bring it to Hamburg when he should come there for the purpose of escorting her to England. By side of this obvious inference, the sentence in that *Mg Post* letter regarding a "formal notice of rupture," sent to the first contractor two days *after* a contract with a second had been signed, is positively jocose. Rather a grim joke, in light of the subsequent evidence of Gye's attorney: "I called Mr. Gye's attention to an article in the *Sunday Times*. Mr. Gye and Mr. Wagner agreed that it was necessary that an answer should be given. Mr. Gye took down Mr. Wagner's answer as to a part. Part was written by Mr. Gye for himself. I think one copy was signed by Mr. Wagner."

To return to reliable history. Five days after Gye's departure from Hamburg, Johanna has to undergo a painful scene, à la Lucia di Lammermoor. Bacher turns up—April 10, from Vienna—with the money that had been despaired-of in such mutely suffering patience. In ignorance that any screw was loose, "I went to Hamburg to accompany Miss Wagner to London. I took there the 300*l.* to give her. I changed the money into gold, and offered it to her several times," swears Bacher in his Queen's Bench evidence: "The first thing she said was, 'I have committed a very bad action against you.' I said, 'What have you done?' She said, 'I have signed another engagement.' I answered, 'That is impossible.' She said, 'As I signed the engagement my hands trembled, but Mr. Gye had been here to say to us that Mr. Lumley would not open, and offered me 20,000 f. more, and gave me a guarantee for all the damages. I was so much embarrassed, I had not time to think. You have not sent me the 300*l.*, and thereupon

we signed.' Upon that I replied, 'Have I not written to you and offered you payment, and asked you if I should send the money to Berlin or bring it to Hamburg myself? Upon this I received your answer that you would see me at Hamburg. Therefore, as you did not wish to receive the money at Berlin, I have now come ready to pay you.' Upon this she said she regretted very much she had signed it. Upon that I asked why she had not asked legal counsel before she signed it. She answered she had no time to do it; that Mr. Gye pressed upon her to sign it. She then said, 'After that, we saw our counsel, and he said to us we did very wrong to sign.'"

Poor Johanna! one can't help feeling sorry for her, compelled by her relations to default. At that moment her name is being announced in London as the bright particular star of *two* rival theatres, and strong must be her forebodings that trouble may ensue. Nor are her painful Hamburg interviews at end, her Easter holidays to terminate in peace; for, alarmed by the opposition announcement of the 8th, apparently confirmed by receipt two days thereafter either of a telegram from Bacher, or of Albert's cool "notice of rupture," Lumley himself arrives at the Hanseatic city April 13, accompanied by Mitchell the box-agent, who had increased his usual subscription from £5000 to £15,000 on the strength of Johanna's fame, and now takes with him £1200 to help restore the Wagners to the primrose path of duty. Over that third harrowing interview a veil is cast; "I took no part in it," swears Mitchell, but "I arrived with Mr. Lumley, Madame Sontag, and Miss Wagner and her father at Cologne on the 14th.* Mr. Gye was there . . . Mr. Gye took charge of Miss Wagner to London." Poor Johanna, again! Is it as Queen of Song, or prisoner of war, that she is being led to our only-by-money-rewarding shores?

The game of announcement and counter-announcement goes merrily on; but April 23, the day after that *Mg Post* letter, Lumley obtains an 'ex parte' injunction in Chancery, "restraining Miss Wagner from singing at any theatre except Her Majesty's." Undeterred, in the *Times* of the 24th Gye announces his expectation of getting that injunction dissolved and having Johanna to sing that night in *Le Prophète*. Far from the injunction being dissolved, it is continued on the 10th of May by the Vice-Chancellor, after a two-day hearing. An

* "About 4 o'clock in the afternoon of Thursday, the 15th inst. a gentleman of the name of Mitchell arrived at Hamburg from London, and about 7 o'clock in the evening of that day, the money was for the first time tendered," says the over-circumstantial *Mg Post* letter; but, though "Albert" writes less than a week after the alleged occurrence, the oath of the business-man Mitchell, relying on his office-books, is of more value, even at the distance of two years, than that tissue of misrepresentations, every one of which has its ulterior object.

appeal to the Lord Chancellor, also occupying two days, results in confirmation of the order May 27. Meantime Johanna is invited by Lumley to make due appearance at Her Majesty's, but answers by referring to a letter in which Gye had recently proposed to Lumley that she should divide herself between the rival houses, giving each one night a week! Finally, a decree is made absolute June 24, perpetually restraining her from appearing at Gye's "or at any other English theatre than Her Majesty's." But the three months for which she had been engaged by Lumley have by now almost elapsed, and shortly thereafter she leaves this country without having sung in public at all, though presumably still in possession of the £1000 Gye had paid her at Hamburg, the cheque for which she is proved to have cashed at Coutts' bank.

Her troubles, with which we can have sympathy only in so far as they sprang from her father, were by no means ended. In 1853 Lumley instituted legal proceedings against Gye, to recover damages for the heavy loss he had incurred by the complete wrecking of his 1852 season's arrangements, and in June an English Q.C. was despatched to Germany, by order of an English judge, "to examine Miss Wagner and her father," as they necessarily were considered "most material witnesses." But "Miss Wagner refused to consent to be examined in any other manner than before a judge of her own country and in her own language." Then in January 54 a fresh 'commission' was issued to examine those "most material witnesses" according to the law of Prussia; this was not proceeded with, however, chiefly on account of the great cost involved, several hundred pounds having already been expended on the first attempt.—You will remember that Johanna about this time had written to Weimar that she might "have to go to England" in the Spring (148*n ant.*). Whether her "*muss*" implied an obligation of personal profit, or a moral duty to a ruined London impresario (Lumley), does not appear; but at the trial in the following month Gye swore: "I have used every effort to induce Miss Wagner to come and be examined here. I wrote to her in July last [the very time that Albert was boasting to Liszt of London plans!], and on other occasions. I also went personally to see her. I wished her to submit to an examination in Vienna, where she then was. I urged her to come and be examined." Neither she nor her father came to the assistance of *either* of the parties with whom they had cross-contracted, and who had bled "money" for them to worse than no purpose.

That trial, before Lord Campbell and a special jury, assumed the proportions of a *cause célèbre*. In addition to a fifteen-column report, the *Musical World* of Feb. 25, 1854, devotes to it a three-column leader, commencing thus: "The long pending action brought by Mr. Lumley against Mr. Gye, on account of Mdlle. Johanna Wagner, has at length come off. The Court of Queen's Bench, on Monday [20th]

and the two following days, was crowded to excess by persons in some way or other connected with the operatic or musical world." How the audience could have been accommodated if the defaulting witnesses had actually appeared, Heaven only knows; for some of the ticket-agents stated in evidence that "Jenny Lind created what they termed 'the Lind fever,' and they gave their opinion that in the theatrical world 'the Wagner-fever' was quite as violent"—meaning Johanna, of course, not her uncle, whose name is not so much as incidentally breathed (thank goodness!) in connection with this celebrity who owed her first real start to him. At the end of the trial Lord Campbell put three questions to the jury: first, "Whether the agreement which had been entered into between the plaintiff [Lumley] and Miss Wagner remained in force at the time when it was alleged the defendant [Gye] had induced her to break it; secondly, whether the defendant induced Miss Wagner to break the agreement, and whether she broke it in consequence of his inducement; and thirdly, whether the defendant at that time knew that the agreement between Miss Wagner and the plaintiff was then in existence." The first two the jury answered in the affirmative, the third in the negative (amounting in law to a verdict for the defendant Gye, though he had to bear two thirds of the costs): that is to say, so far as concerns Albert and Johanna, a third English court found that they had wriggled out of a contract, on the eve of performance, for sake of a larger slice of "England's only reward." And in this instance one can but agree, in the main, with the conclusion of the leader in the *M. World:* "For our own parts, strongly sympathising as we do with Mr. Lumley, in his misfortunes—and to Mr. Lumley the public owe no small debt of gratitude for the magnificent entertainments he provided—we are heartily glad that the attempt at creating a new 'Dog Star,' to outshine all the other luminaries in the Operatic heaven, has totally failed. At the same time we must avow our belief that Mdlle. Johanna Wagner would never have answered the expectations the public had formed of her; and that the lady herself, more than any one, has cause to rejoice in the misunderstanding which prevented her from risking the depreciation of that fame which she had undoubtedly acquired in her own country, but which it is more than probable she would have failed to maintain in another. As far as Mdlle. Wagner is individually concerned in the matter, not as an artist, but as a maker of bargains, we must candidly own that her behaviour does not entitle her to the respect and consideration of the English public." If that be too severe, it is because it does not take into consideration the pressure brought to bear by Lucia-Johanna's father, who "transacts business for her."

Naturally wishful to obtain compensation for losses that had reduced him to bankruptcy (Mitchell alone lost "over £5000" by

that 52 season), Lumley appealed from the jury's decision, which had sent him empty away with the bare satisfaction that the perpetual injunction against Johanna's appearance elsewhere still remained in force. The case therefore came up once more in the Court of Queen's Bench, June 1, '54, this time without witnesses or jury, but before three judges 'in banco,' Lord Chief Justice Campbell, and Justices Erle and Crompton. The verdict of last February was upheld, and that terminated the litigation. Consequently, a fourth English court maintained that Albert and Johanna Wagner had broken their contract with Lumley while concealing a material fact from their instigator Gye. Two years later a reconciliation was effected between Lumley and Johanna, and she came to London for a brief appearance 1856, after many protestations of contrition, which we may welcome as sincere: "I hope the results of the new engagement will efface the past for ever; I am sure you will do everything to support me and make me love [loved in?] your beautiful England," is one of these expressions quoted in Lumley's *Reminiscences*. For that transient success perhaps I may find room next volume; suffice it here to say, that the lady's earlier fickleness would seem to have damped it in the mind of a public keener than any other to reward a great singer's willingness with worship.

As affecting our hero, three points remain to be considered in this matter:—1°, its bearing on Albert's underhand remarks about his brother's "character" and "disagreeable correspondence" (323 and 326 *ant.*). After our present experience, we should hardly go to Albert for a testimonial, nor should we altogether yearn for an epistle from him (cf. 361).—2°, its bearing on Richard's own London reception a twelvemonth after the Queen's Bench *cause célèbre*. Not a word stands printed by the English press, to the best of my knowledge, connecting uncle with niece; yet the relationship could not fail to leak out when the composer's music first reached our shores, and unexampledly savage are the attacks made on his *Tannhäuser* overture just two months after that trial (first perf. in Eng., Apr. 26, 54). The surname Wagner decidedly revived no pleasant memories at the time, and the systematic persecution to which he was subjected in 55 (to be related next volume) may be traced in some sort to that cause.—3°, the entire absence of the smallest effort on Albert's or his daughter's part to advance their exiled brother-uncle's cause in a land where he might have moved free. The choice of Johanna's London rôles lay in her and her father's hands, and Lumley would have jumped at a spectacular novelty, such as *Tannhäuser* or *Lohengrin* seen through opera-glasses, had it but been thrust under his nose; yet this is the list they drew up in their contract for Her Majesty's: "1st, Romeo (Bellini), 2nd, Fides (Prophète) and 3rd, Valentine (Huguenots). These parts once sung, then only will she appear, if

Mr. Lumley desires it, in the three other operas mentioned aforesaid" —those other parts being "4, Anna (Don Juan), 5, Alice (Robert le diable), 6 an opera chosen by common accord."* A Bellini rôle; three Meyerbeers and one Mozart; *no* Richard Wagner.

We have heard through Dr Bacher of Johanna's intimacy with Meyerbeer; counsel on the other side endorses it. Now listen to the lady herself, in that letter of Nov. 51 to Bacher which dealt with both London and Paris: "Meyerbeer is coming to me respecting some alterations in Alice. I will not detain this letter any longer, and therefore conclude it with earnest regards and thanks, best friend. Our Grand Maestro is, God be praised, pretty well again; at least he goes out a good deal." There you have the key to much in Wagner's Berlin disappointments; his own flesh and blood can praise God that the creator of "Alice" is suffering a little less from the effects of fat living, while the uncle who personally brought out his first "Elisabeth" gets no sign of sympathy with his suffering from barely a living at all. If Richard Wagner ever "goes out a good deal" again, it will be small thanks to Albert or Johanna.

Pages 153-4 *n.* LETTER ON TECHNICAL CRITICISM (cf 84).—The following is a translation of that letter to Louis Köhler (pubd *Bayr. Bl.* 1895) which had preyed on Wagner's nerves before he wrote it; a mere physical dread (eyestrain again), since the vigour of thought is by no means abated:—

"Do not be cross with me, esteemed Friend, that I have left your letter unanswered so long. Shortly after its receipt came Liszt's visit, and directly after that I journeyed hither, to the heights of Graubünden, to undergo a cure. Moreover, apart from my scant time for quiet, I had no great inclination to fall into æsthetic theorising of any kind, to which I could but fear being tempted with a letter to you. Now I have plucked up hope that it may be managed without, I should like to answer you at least in brief, to tell you that your sympathy has heartily rejoiced me, and in particular that I wish your last self-sacrificing trip from Königsberg had brought you something better than the fairly incorrect and spiritless performance—as I know—of my 'Tannhäuser' at Leipzig.

"Your book at anyrate surprised me; much of it is so near a concern of mine, that it could not stay strange to me: even before you sent it, I had read it [figuratively speaking].

---

* "These six parts belong exclusively to Mlle Wagner, and any other cantatrice shall not presume to sing them during the three months of her engagement"—proceeds the far from humble document—"Mlle Wagner binds herself to sing twice a week during the run of the three months . . . £1200 . . . £50 sterling for each representation extra."

"Your idea, of pursuing Melody into *Speech*, is proof of your great earnestness in the matter: very happy were your discoveries of right melodic and harmonic accents. At bottom, indeed, I'm becoming more and more convinced that these are things each man does wisest to settle for himself: yet, as such a heap of rubbish gets taught, the wish to contribute to a rational mode of teaching perhaps is very natural. In this regard I have repeatedly impressed on Brendel [those letters should be valuable, if preserved] that his journal should keep much more to what is learnable, to *technique*. The contents (*Inhalt*) of an artwork are a matter for the individual, no subject for criticism; here it is a question of feeling a liking or dislike, and that, again, is every individual's affair. Technique, on the other hand, is the collective property of the artists of all ages; one inherits it from the other, each adding to it and forming it as well as he can and must. About that one can speak, though naturally among artists alone: the layman should never hear talk of it. And I really believe, through my writings, I myself have given much occasion for the discussion of leading questions of technique, notwithstanding there is little or nothing as yet to shew me that this has been recognised.

"If there is one important subject I have raised in this regard, it is that of the relation of Poetry and Music in general, or of the *speaking-verse* to *melody* in particular. I should think it a very apt attempt, to lay the nature of modern word-verse intelligibly—and exhaustively—bare, shewing how it has built itself up with no heed whatsoever to musical melody, as an exclusive preserve of our literary poets; and thus to furnish proof—by many an example—that this Verse *cannot* be composed at all, because our modern Melody has evolved from quite other, from absolute-musical elements, that have not the smallest jot in common with that literary verse. From this one false relation of artistic technique one might convincingly deduce the whole false relation of our Literature-poetry to our Music: but only by means of a thoroughly detailed exposition of the purely technical bearings, could this succeed. All declaiming anent the general problem is utterly useless, and Brendel now finds himself continually besieged with questions, 'What, then, are we to do? Are we to go on composing, at all; to compose operas; or, if not, what?' I have advised him to make these questions, and the fact of their having reached him, a theme in itself; on careful inquiry it would be bound to come out, that we are fashing ourselves with an obsolete ancestral technique, in which no artistic content can be offered any longer; wherefore we need not wonder if our cleverest music tells us—nothing.

"Well, I'm glad that you also have felt this out for yourself: your book is evidence thereof. Merely, I could wish you did not stop at the general impressions you derive from detached verbal phrases, but took the true melodic verbal-phrase, the *verse*, more definitely in

eye. If, e.g. you leave the literary verse precisely where it is, and simply sing it according to whatever of musical melody it may contain, in the best event you merely get what I have elsewhere called 'prosaic melody,' 'musical prose': but it is just this prose that must no longer have a chance of appearing, if we are to remove from our —relatively best—music the character of unmelodic vagueness. In the first quarter of the third volume [now "Part"] of 'Opera and Drama,' in particular, I believe I expressed myself sufficiently upon this head: daily do I have to see, however, how little I have as yet been regarded. It would earn you thanks, were you to take paragraph by paragraph for subject of a demonstration sown with pointed detail. That alone would be of use, nothing else—and everyone flies off into unsubstantial exclamation!

"Enough of theory for to-day: it doesn't suit me! 'Twas from theory that I caught my illness, and I expect recovery from nothing save artistic creation. About Art I can 'write' no more. Perhaps, however, you'll some day still get something better from me—something to hear and see! Farewell! I'm here 3 weeks longer, then back at Zurich in the first place.

"St. Moritz, Canton Graubünden Your
24. July 1853. RICHARD WAGNER."

What makes this letter so important, is its repudiation in advance of the method almost invariably pursued by the Cardinals of Wagnerism: *they* insist on expounding those very "contents" which the master declares not discussable; *he*, true artist that he is, would have them turn their minds to "technique," the very point on which their fluffy "exclamations" prove their weakness. On second thought, however, I fancy he would have modified that reservation re "the layman"; for, how is the layman to be led to *artistic* appreciation of a work of art, if he never be given a technical hint or two to guide and help him also to a clearer judgment? It is merely a question as to *where* to draw the line, and the fact of Wagner's advocating technical discussions in a journal largely dependent on the amateur for circulation, shews that we must not take that reservation too precisely, particularly as it is a mere by-the-way in a private letter. Wagner never set himself up as Pope, whatever his sacerdotes may claim for him. His attitude, attested by much besides the present letter, was that of the *searcher* after truth and encourager of such a search in others.

Page 192. BÜLOW'S PIANOFORTE-ARRANGEMENTS.—Hans von Bülow's vocal score of *Tristan und Isolde* and pfte arrangements of the *Huldigungsmarsch*, the *Faust* and *Meistersinger* overtures, are universally recognised to be such masterpieces of fidelity and fluency, that we can well understand Wagner's singling him out for work of

the kind a number of years before.* The first we hear of it is in the young man's letter of Oct. 12, '53, to his mother: "Wagner has commissioned me with Lohengrin and Tannhäuser arrangements, and I am *certain* to earn something by these tasks, which don't brook much delay. Wagner's and Meser's creditors have taken Tannhäuser in hand, and I can make my own conditions—as it is becoming an enormously lucrative business." Hans judges the Dresden publication-venture as any outsider would have done: it *ought* to have been "enormously lucrative" by then, with an opera that had already become a standing dish at two-and-twenty German theatres; but Meser, as stated more than once, was an irreclaimable muddler, and no efforts of Wagner or his easy-going creditors could ever put life into his conduct of the business. Thus the composer, on his way to London, writes Fischer in March '55: "Has nothing further appeared as yet of the pfte arrangement of Tannhäuser *without words?* I should also be glad to have whatever of it is ready.—My heart bleeds when I think of this publication business: what might be drawn from it now, were it managed with go and gumption! But unfortunately I hear nothing at all, not even from my creditors, who really ought to take some interest in it."

There can be very little doubt that Wagner here refers to Bülow's work, since the young man had written Liszt June 29, '54: "I am making a series of four-handed arrangements of 'Tannhäuser'—though they are slow to appear"; and to Pohl in September, "The Tannhäuser-process is slumbering—no matter"; to which the editor of Bülow's letters adds a footnote, "Wagner against his publisher Meser," albeit it is difficult to see how a man under political warrant of arrest could institute a civil action in a fatherland to which he refused to yield himself up;† judging by a context which deals with Bülow's other occupations, the "process" is more probably a mere figure of speech, such as Hans was extremely fond of. In any case

---

* In this connection I may cite Berlioz' tribute to Hans' execution of a similar task. July 28, 1854, he writes von Bülow: "You have given me a charming surprise with your manuscript, which arrived all the more à-propos as Brandus, who is engraving 'Cellini' at this moment, had chosen a rather obscure piano-strummer to arrange the overture. Your work is admirable, of rare clearness and fidelity, and as little difficult as possible to make it without altering my score. I therefore thank you for it with all my heart. I shall go and see Brandus this evening, and take him your precious manuscript."

† In fact we now have direct testimony to the contrary, since Wagner's lately-published letters to Schindelmeisser contain the following:—May 6, 52, "Concerning the fee [for *Tannhäuser* at Wiesbaden], I decidedly prefer receiving something definite the moment the score is bought, if only for reason that, with revenue of that kind, I have to fear the Saxon State-exchequer—to

he writes A. Ritter on Christmas day '54 : "In my fortnight's holiday I must and will make some four-handed arrangements of Tannhäuser for Meser"; so that his work would seem to have been undertaken in bits, whenever the slow-moving publisher felt bold enough to invest fifty thalers or so in a venture which any man of sense would have launched *en bloc*. How slow Meser moved, may be judged from an announcement in the *Neue Zeitschrift* of Jan. 25, '56 : "Of Hans v. Bülow's new pianoforte-arrangement of Wagner's Tannhäuser for four hands, published in single detached scenes, the following have hitherto appeared : Act I. no. 1—Introduction : Der Venusberg ; Act II. no. 7—Einzug der Gäste auf der Wartburg ; Act III. no. 12 —Wolfram's Romance 'an den Abendstern.'—The remaining numbers will appear in quick succession." Will that succession be quick? I cannot say, but much doubt it ; for our national copy of the four-handed pfte arrangement pubd by Meser (with no arranger's name) bears the British Museum stamp of receipt "5. Jan. 61," and must have then been quite a recent publication, since it contains the "Paris" ending of the overture. Another four-handed copy is also possessed by our Museum, published by Flaxland of Paris, with Bülow's name on the title-page, to which is added "Bacchanale arrangée par E. Guiraud" (official stamp "11. Feb. 75"—evidently acquired many years after publication). Whether these two versions are substantially the same, I must leave others to explore, while I trace the much more interesting history of the *Lohengrin* affair.

In the body of the present volume I have related Wagner's proposition that Breitkopf and Härtel, among other things, should publish five pieces to be arranged by Bülow for pianoforte solo after a selection from *Lohengrin* made by the composer himself. For this purpose it is plain that Wagner lent him at Basle in October the "nine detached vocal pieces" he himself had recast, since Hans writes Liszt from Dresden Dec. 12, '53 : "Wagner has just begged me to send you his '*lyrische Stücke aus Lohengrin*,' for you to give them to Härtel in exchange for more dramatic pieces, to wit, banknotes. I will execute this commission tomorrow." Liszt replies on the 14th : "Apropos of honoraria, I fear that Härtel will abide by his refusal to engrave the pieces from Lohengrin, for reasons which I will

---

whom all my property stands forfeit (because of High treason)" ; and Aug. 13, 53, "I ought to mention that I have recently had serious grounds again for suspecting that it might suddenly occur to the Dresden State-police to lay a distraint on my takings : (it would only need a personal ill-wisher of mine to draw attention thereto, and do it they *must!*). For this reason I am now making a point, once more, of getting my fee in *advance*." For the "recent serious grounds" cf 115 *ant.*, for the consequent "anxiety" 159*n*.

explain to you verbally. I have just written Wagner on this subject, and I propose that he should either publish them with *his* name alone, or send them to me, that I may add mine—in which case I should of course place the fee at his disposal." The last sentence points to a portion of Liszt's letter of Dec. 13 to Wagner having been omitted from the published collection, also to a similar omission from Wagner's reply of the 17th; for Liszt's next to Wagner (Dec. 29) says, "The 9 Lohengrin numbers which Hans lately sent me [Wagner's *vocal* pieces], I have handed in to Härtels—and you will receive news about them at the same time as these lines, since Dr Härtel assured me yesterday that he would write you direct and without delay. *En fin de compte* the Härtels are thoroughly reliable, and if you will excuse me, I advise you to ménager their well-deserved renown as publishers, as I am convinced that your relations with them will turn to your advantage later on." This is already a different story to that of a fortnight ago (*cf.* 191 *ant.*), and Liszt seems to have had his suspicions somewhat easily dispelled; but now comes the part where his advice *re* Bülow is also the opposite of what it had been a fortnight back, for he continues: "And as I have already been *appointed by yourself* your humble privy councillor, I will make the further observation, that I consider it will be quite in order if you insist on Hans's name appearing in the issue of the Lohengrin pianoforte pieces—as there seems to be no reasonable ground for denying Hans this satisfaction, and he deserves that distinction through his faithful, energetic attachment to you, as also through his positive talent.—Härtels, moreover, will end by agreeing to it, and I have already spoken to them in this sense. Naturally I have to proceed very gingerly in such affairs.—Here and there, 'tis true, it costs me a little trouble.—But so it must be, and secondary questions must not hinder or endanger the main affair.—So, when you answer Härtels, write them that you *particularly* wish that Hans's name should be published as arranger of your Lohengrin pieces for the pianoforte; and that, if you compose other operas later, you will likewise entrust the pfte arrangement of them to Hans.—Hans is devoted to you heart and soul, and you may be sure he will do the work to your satisfaction.—Further, if it is agreeable to you, I will gladly revise the arrangement, and send it to yourself in the last instance, so that *not one note* may remain that does not please you and is not justified alike by pfte technique and the composition."

A longish quotation on a minor subject, no doubt; but the testimony to young Bülow's devotion alone was worth it, whilst it also was necessary to set the passage in its proper light. As it stands in the W.-L. Correspondence, it rather conveys the impression that *Wagner* had wanted to suppress Hans' name: on comparison with the letter of Dec. 14 to Hans himself, we now see that that was Liszt's own

first proposal. But what reason can there have been for any such suggestion?—One possible answer I do not like to entertain, and therefore confine myself to another, which will at the same time explain why the pfte arrangements themselves were stubbornly rejected. Hans had placed himself in bad odour with the Leipzig clique by attacking one of their idols, the singer Henriette Sontag, in an article contributed to the *Neue Zeitschrift* of Feb. 13, 52, and it was very long before they forgave his audacity; the doors of the Gewandhaus were to be slammed in his face early in 54. Thus there was almost invariably some personal element behind the opposition met by Wagner and his young adherents; and Liszt overrated his diplomatic power when he flattered himself that smooth words would succeed in disarming the enemy, for they only drew himself eventually into the ring of fire.

To resume: Dec. 30, 53, Liszt writes von Bülow, "The detached pieces from Lohengrin which you sent me [Wagner's *vocal* pieces] are in the hands of Härtel, who will be delighted to publish them, and has promised to write Wagner at once. I took the occasion to speak to him again of your arrangements for the piano, and believe I have favourably inclined him. In my letter to Wagner I have just asked him to insist on it, with Härtel, that these pieces shall appear *signed* with your name, and I hope the thing will finish in this sense." It finished, alas! in quite another sense, for Liszt's next reference to the subject runs as follows: "The Härtels of Leipzig have had the obligingness to narrate to me in writing the scene that took place in their office apropos of the Lohengrin arrangements. I answered to the Dr, giving you the praise that is your due—but unless something unforeseen should happen, I do not think that this affair can be negotiated in the way I should have desired. For the rest, in spite of hearsay, it would seem that Ehrlich has not yet been commissioned by Härtel with these arrangements, as he writes me again this morning to ask me to influence the Härtels to give him the job. I am still waiting for Härtel's answer to my last letter" (to B., Apr. 24, '54).

The nature of the "scene" in Breitkopf and Härtel's office we can only judge from Bülow's habitual resentment of injustice or shilly-shallying, and from the following sentence in his reply to Liszt of April 30: "I shall have great pleasure in attending your rehearsal at Leipzig [it did not come off, owing to the usual Leipzig obstacles]. This little journey will also afford me occasion to give Dr Härtel a piece of my mind; which I am fully determined to." To this Liszt answers May 14: "I will tell you some details relative to the arrangement of the Lohengrin pieces next time we meet. Next week I shall send Härtel two or three numbers which I have transcribed myself, and which I promised him long before the démêlé you have had with him. If you will permit me to give you what I think sensible advice, I beseech you

not to say another word, or take another step *of any kind* with regard to this incident, which I cannot but regret. What good would it do, for you to abuse Dr Härtel? It could be of no utility either for you, for Wagner, or for Lohengrin; not to mention that a scene of this sort would be more than disagreeable to myself. I entreat you, dear friend, set yourself a little more in tune with men and things as they are, and as it is not in our power to change them."

All the actors in this "scene" strike one as having been more or less in the wrong; but was the chief offender Dr Härtel? In any case he thus deprived the pianoforte-playing world of a most valuable addition to musical literature, and apparently from the same spirit of timidity that had recently prompted him to reject Wagner's offer re the *Lohengrin* performing-rights, and will hereafter lose him the golden chance of publishing the *Ring des Nibelungen*—two splendid business opportunities shortsightedly let slip.

Page 229 *et passim.* WAGNER'S LETTERS TO SCHINDELMEISSER.—After nearly a half of the present volume had already been committed to the printers' hands, the first quarterly number of the *Bayreuther Blätter* 1904 gave to the world an invaluable collection of letters addressed by Richard Wagner to one of his earliest friends, Louis Schindelmeisser (see vols. i and iii); a collection confessedly somewhat incomplete, as the letters appear to have been dispersed at their recipient's death in 1864 (March 30, five weeks before the great change in their writer's fortunes). The intimacy thus revealed is much greater than had been imagined hitherto, and this collection consequently adds another portrait to the Wagner gallery, another pale ghost transformed into an individuality. Here we certainly have one of the most genuine of the master's art-comrades, and a practical propagandist scarcely second in efficacy to Liszt, in the fifties at least.

One of these letters I have been able to introduce into the body of the present vol., pp. 317-9; very little space can I afford—I can *afford* in reality none—for extracts bearing on other of its contents. Without wasting words, then, I must tell you that, after three epistles of the year 1837 dealing with Wagner's Riga appointment (which S. assisted him to secure), the next that have come down to us point to a long interval of mutual estrangement, happily overcome as follows:—

Kaufhold, the "Erik" of the Zurich *Holländer*, ought to have gone (or returned?) to Wiesbaden at the beginning of May 1852: "Yesterday he told me"—writes W. to S. on the 1st—"that he feared getting into terrible hot water with you and your Director, if he stayed to sing here on the 2nd May [fourth *Holl.* performance, given extra]. This made me promise him that I would write you myself, and take advantage of our

ancient friendship to beg you for tidings and a word in Kaufhold's favour with your management. I almost hope my petition will avail, and—in memory of our youthful Leipzig days—you will do your utmost to spare me a refusal," etc. The ice only needed breaking on one side, and it at once is plain sailing again; for on the 6th Wagner writes to "Dear Louis"—even the letter of the 1st had thus commenced—"Just a few lines to thank you in the first place for the Kaufhold affair.—By asking for Tannhäuser you somewhat surprise me [it was the first firm offer after Schwerin, the second after Weimar]: in that regard I have become a little squeamish, and rather renounce all propaganda of my operas unless I can feel assured of a good spirit in the representation. But you know, I hope, what you're asking, and have considered the difficulties involved in the performance, especially of the principal part. So, if you have good trust that you can overcome them, it will delight me to commit myself once more to your friendly zeal," etc. And ten days later, "I admire the courage with which you are going for Tannhäuser . . . I hope you know it and are aware that it will give you much toil and trouble; so, if you're acting with full conviction of the hardness of the task, I very heartily thank you. . . . In youth I called you my friend: life has divided us in space—perhaps also in spirit; a pesky rivalry, the nature of which I never quite knew, once almost set us at enmity. Were I now to succeed with full consciousness in winning you as friend, I should reckon it a double gain; for together with the old friend I now should gain a new"—a sentiment reiterated Nov. 12 of that year, the day before the Wiesbaden première of *Tannh.*: "If ever a thing has rejoiced me highly, it was your last letter, and the beautiful experience I am reaping with you. God knows how widely life had torn us friends of youth asunder, and surely neither of us expected ever to meet the other again. Must not our joy be great, that we thus recover one another in the end? My heartiest greetings!"

The remarks about *Tannhäuser* in these letters are of special interest, but I must regretfully pass them over, excepting this concerning its success at Frankfort, "Without a doubt *your* example at Wiesbaden has contributed much to that miracle. So—my thanks include *yourself!*" (Feb. 16, 53—the day of the public reading of *Rheingold* at Zurich). Then, apropos of the Zurich festival-concerts: "Still in want of bandsmen, I wrote to Wiesbaden because I knew of the vacation there. Herr Grimm junior now tells me that it ends the 7th of May: but I want my people from the 15th to the evening of the 22nd. Grimm thinks you might still be able to spare me 2 violins, 1 cello, 1 contrabass and 2 horns for that period. I beg you urgently, do *make it possible;* otherwise I shall be in a horrible fix, since the Munich Kapellists have lately cried off, as their Intendance will give them no leave for Switzerland!! I also still lack the bass-

clarinet and a good *bass-tuba* (bombardon) *or* a good *tenor trombone*. —Man, friend and benefactor! In my whole life I'll not do it again; but don't leave me stranded this time. The bandsmen will be glad to come" (May 3, 53—*cf.* 105-6 *ant.*). And after the event, "I thank you once more for your conclusive support of my concerts: you sent me capital musicians and charming men, who gave me great delight. Unfortunately I couldn't make such close acquaintance with each individual as I should much have liked; yet we parted good friends —I fancy—and I shall recall myself to the memory of each of them so soon as I can send my promised portrait.—You will probably have heard enough by mouth about the issue. The orchestra on the whole —especially in the strings—was very good, and had an excellent sound; the wood-wind left a little to desire, owing to the unexpected abstention of a few able artists. My whole original personal aim, with this enterprise, was to hear the orchestral prelude to Lohengrin for once; that very much moved me, and well rendered it was. Frisch will tell you all about the needful mode of phrasing; really it is only a question of closest observance of the written signs, especially of the 'evenly p.' in the violins and wood-wind from the moment each has handed the theme over to a fresh instrumental family, and merely forms the accompaniment; on the other hand, it is of utmost importance that the theme should be played with full shading each time. The tempo is *very* slow; guard against any hurrying of the triplets that occur in the theme."

This lengthy letter of May 29, 53, a preparation for the Wiesbaden production of *Lohengrin*, also contains minute directions how to manage the 'divided' violins for a smallish orchestra, and so on. Presently we get the following: "Of prime moment is *Lohengrin* himself: in Peretti you seem to have a good performer; is he also young and radiant enough? This is something quite other than Tannhäuser: through his outward appearance and the timbre of his voice this Lohengrin must work the wonders of a Saviour, and stir all hearts to throes of bliss! Have a care! The Weimar Lohengrin [Beck] was *atrocious! !*—As regards Weimar, I may further tell you, that all the *purely musical* side was quite splendidly seen to by *Liszt* from the first, whereas the mounting and acting remained entirely neglected under the control of an insipid regisseur. They applied to me for what they thought needful abridgments: I had learnt where the hitch lay, and replied, they might cut whatever they liked, as the very fact of their thinking they must, was proof enough to me that the representation had turned out full of faults. Then the regisseur proposed a few specific cuts to me: I had to shew him that the very parts he wanted to excise had not been understood by him, and, on the contrary, how he had to set about bringing those passages to their necessary significance. Next, they tried awhile to leave out this or

that (for sake of saving 5 to 10 minutes); but Liszt then espied how the land lay, and Lohengrin has since been never given at Weimar except entire, without any cuts. That in this way the total effect is exhausting, is not to be disputed: yet that is in the nature of the thing: I offer no armchair enjoyment, but spread affright and stir; otherwise I cannot operate on the men of to-day. If that nature of the thing be altered, it necessarily is maimed; nothing but discomfort remains, and the true effect doesn't happen at all. Wherefore: prove your forces in what they are able to give, and in what you are able to receive and endure; if my work doesn't chime with them, leave it alone; but don't force another nature on it than its own. I can say nothing else to you. Who goes with me, must be able and willing to play 'va banque!'—not as if I were something so extraordinary and gigantic, but just because my works are products of a man who cares no more for any other kind of play than that with which one either breaks the bank or smashes oneself: I want no 'soft' existence with 'all possible celebrity and good cheer'!"—There follows a deal about Schöneck (*cf* 102 *ant.*), which must not delay us.

A letter of July 5, 53, thanks Schindelmeisser for the Wiesbaden première of *Lohengrin* three days previously: "At least you will not believe my thanks hollow, as my care may be the measure to you of the joy I feel at your simple assurance that you have succeeded in producing a strong and favourable effect with this opera." From this letter I *must* quote a rather long passage:—

"Regarding all for which *you* were responsible I could not feel anxious, but solely as to that which lies beyond your province: I mean the *staging* (*Scene*); not, however, in the sense wherein the scene will have lain open to you as well, but as a thing at present manifest to *me* alone — believe me. Remember, please, I haven't mounted Lohengrin myself as yet: when I think of the many experiences I still had to make when I set Tannh. on the actual stage—after everything had been minutely calculated by me in advance—I realise that Lohengrin itself, in a certain sense, is not as yet completed by *myself*. I know that a quantity of weighty bearings still lie hid here, as to which I myself should have first grown quite clear when *I* had once produced it with all needful means. For this I have merely the experiences of Weimar before me, and now Liszt assures me [this is the third day of L.'s Zurich visit] that it was only through his most unheard-of personal exertions that he could succeed on a roundabout path in retrieving for an understanding of the opera there what had been missed in its direct performance; albeit I give Liszt—as *musical* conductor—the highest praise. Now—after 3 years—they at last perceive at Weimar that wellnigh all the scenery must be procured afresh, because the earlier setting had been done without sufficient knowledge of my intentions;

moreover, they recognise *now* what depends on it, namely the possibility of whole musical pieces—particularly in the 2nd and 3rd acts. So in this regard it is by no means tranquillising to hear from you, for instance, that your people also—relying on Weimar's false lead—have turned the last act into two. That downright cuts me to the heart!—To make a full act-close after the scene between Lohengrin and Elsa—seeing the mode in which it terminates—is to me a torture I positively could not bear if I were present at any such performance. What was the cause of it? Quite certainly, nothing but that the scenepainter (or machinist) didn't understand my ever so minutely-given stage-directions: had these but been carefully followed, had the bride-chamber been arranged as I wish (narrowing its space on the boards), had the special curtains been fixed and drawn, and the meadow-scene set ready behind as it should be, it would never have occurred to the machinist to make a full close of an act here. At Weimar all this was also done without my knowledge [see next note]: my protest came too late; and *now* they're having the opera mounted all over again.—I know, however, that it needs not only understanding—but also means, for this; and very ample means, since it is just these nice points of execution that demand the most precise and costly devices . . ." A few sentences later, we hear that Wagner's ideal for the prelude is "at least 20 violins," and for the men's choruses "at least 40 voices." Then comes a kind apology: "Only lately have I had occasion to busy myself with Lohengrin a little: at the bare idea of producing this opera itself I felt the fearful exactions of the task in every nerve and muscle, and was quite horrified to think of such a burden being thrust upon another. Will you be vexed if I sighed for a moment, and fancied I had asked too much of you, too, with this task? Certainly not, if you understand me aright!"

Skipping much besides of interest, we alight on a letter of April 26, 54 (*cf.* 317), with its allusion to the production of *Lohengrin* at Darmstadt, whither S. has been recently promoted: "Since the renewal of our friendship I am so used to the beautiful necessity of thanks, that I almost fear my letters strike you as very monotonous! Nevertheless I must tell you that I have been refreshed once more by a share of the joy you are reaping yourself from the success of your great exertions. Thereby I find myself so richly indemnified for all wounds from elsewhere, that experiences such as I'm making with you are truly a full compensation.—So *once again:* **Thanks**!—Through the irksome plight that so stubbornly withholds me from a hearing of just this Lohengrin, I certainly am often plunged in consuming depression; only my occupation with new works, and a vista of plans for their eventual performance, help me over my lot as best they may. Were I once set free, be sure you would be the first I'd make a call on. Meanwhile it rejoices me heartily, that you've not given up the idea

of visiting me here: do carry it out this summer! The journey is so short, and our meeting again and a cheery house-companionship (for of course you would stay with me) would have excellent effects. Let me know in good time, when you think of coming. In the first half of July I'm going to take a trip across the Bernese alps to Wallis, where I've promised to conduct a Beethoven symphony—at a music-festival. Perhaps you could do something of the sort too?"

Schindelmeisser does not seem to have ever made the suggested visit, though we shall find Wagner renewing his personal acquaintance when the weary years of exile are over. To other of these priceless letters I shall have occasion to return next volume.

Page 245*n*. FIRST PRINTED TEXTBOOK OF LOHENGRIN.—In my last Appendix I referred to a hitherto uncleared-up sentence in no. 30 of Wagner's letters to Uhlig (Aug. 24, 51): "For God's sake omit from the pfte score of Lohengrin the *preliminary remarks* in the Weimar textbook (concerning Meister Wolfram). They are not *by me*, and are *worthless*." I then hazarded the conjecture that these peccant "remarks" might be traced to Princess Sayn-Wittgenstein. Almost in the same breath I drew attention to Pss Carolyne's departure from Wagner, in the *Lohengrin* analysis, with her "jewel that fell from Lucifer's crown." Little did I expect so soon to find the two points really one; for I had abandoned all hope of procuring that earliest public issue of the poem. Quite recently, however, I saw the rarity announced in the sale-catalogue of a German antiquarian, and strongly advised an English amateur of my acquaintance to secure the prize. This he has done, and kindly granted me a few days' loan of the historic document on my readers' behalf.

A large-quarto pamphlet of two dozen pages, with the text printed in double columns on flimsy paper ('Roman' type), this textbook bears the imprint of "Albrecht's private Court-printinghouse." Formally dated it is not; yet, above the list of dramatis personæ, the 3rd of its preliminary pages displays the words "Zum Erstenmale aufgeführt auf dem Grossherzoglichen Hof-Theater ▭ Weimar den 28. August 1850 ▭ unter der Direction des Herrn Hof-Capellmeister Dr. Franz Liszt," thus stamping it as the first night's 'programme.' Parallel with the list comes the cast, most of whose names were given last volume, saving that the representative of Elsa was there misspelt "Aghte," for which read "Agthe" (subsequently married to barytone Milde): to those please add Frau Hettstedt for the mute rôle of Gottfried, and Herr Pätsch as the earliest exponent of the Herald. The regisseur's name, Herr Genast, is a very old friend; strangers to us are those of the court-scenepainter Herr Holdermann and court-machinist Herr Höck—this trio completing page 3. Page 2 is blank.

Page 1, the ornamental title-page, bears a woodcut, Lohengrin approaching in a swan-drawn coracle, attended by the dove; in addition to his sword, the hero is given a lance with huge fluttering pennant (by way of sail?); besides the basinet, or iron skull-cap on his head, a change of headdress reposes on the tiny poop, a vizored helmet topped with peacock-plumes! Above the picture, "LOHENGRIN"; below it, "**Romantische Oper in drei Acten,** (letzter Act in zwei Abtheilungen) von RICHARD WAGNER.—*Als Manuscript gedruckt.*" Even before acquaintance with the author's letter cited in my last note, I didn't like that bracketed clause, "the last act in two divisions," more especially as the words "Erste Abtheilung" and "Zweite Abtheilung" are also intruded on the body of that act: now we find Wagner rightly lodging a protest against the severance itself, as to which he had never been consulted. The official textbook therefore makes a very bad start, with a false lead to other theatres.

If the Intendant may be held chiefly responsible for that unpunctilious announcement, another author must be sought for the gloss that stands in solitary salience on page 4, in imitation of Wagner's own prefatory note to *Tannhäuser* (*cf.* ii, 98-9) and therefore to be mistaken for his handiwork. "**Anmerkung**:" or Note, it is baldly headed in thick type, and this is how it runs:—

> In Wolfram von Eschenbach's hohem Lied "**Parcival**" heisst es: "Der heilige Gral war die Schale, worin das Blut, welches "aus der Seitenwunde des Erlösers rann, aufgefangen ward; sie "bestand aus einem Edelstein, der beim Sturz Lucifers in den "Abgrund aus dessen Krone fiel. Wer den Gral anschaute, starb "nicht und wer ihm diente, blieb von jeder Todsünde frei. Der "heilige Gral aber wählte sich selber seine Diener und gab ihnen "alle irdischen Freude und himmlische Seligkeit. Er stand in "einem wundersamen Tempel im dichten Walde und es pflegte "ihn eine auserlesene reine Ritterschaft."

Anglice:—"In Wolfram von Eschenbach's lofty poem 'Parcival' we read: 'The holy Grail was the cup wherein was gathered the blood that flowed from the wound in the Redeemer's side; it consisted of a jewel that dropped out of Lucifer's crown as he fell to the abyss. Whoso looked on the Grail, died not; and whoso served it, remained free from every deadly sin. But the holy Grail chose its servitors itself, and gave them every earthly joy and heavenly happiness. It stood in a wondrous temple deep in a wood, and was tended by an elect pure knighthood.'"

No wonder Wagner disclaimed all connection with the above. In truth it is worthless, "*taugt nichts*," as he said, and could but do him harm in the eyes of every scholar; for the peculiarity of Wolfram's version of the legend is flatly contradicted in the first of these sentences erroneously attributed to him. As a fact, Wolfram's variance with

the usual traditions has supplied the learned with a never-ending problem, thus summarised by Miss Jessie L. Weston in a note to her wholly admirable English rendering of his *Parzival* (pubd 1894 by Alfred, *alias* David Nutt, himself a high authority) :—

"The account of the Grail given by Wolfram is most startling, differing as it does from every other account which has come down to us. Wolfram evidently knows nothing whatever of the traditional 'vessel of the Last Supper,' though the fact that the virtue of the stone is renewed every *Good Friday* by a *Host* brought from Heaven seems to indicate that he had some idea of a connection between the Grail and the Passion of our Lord. Various theories have been suggested to account for the choice of a precious stone as the sacred talisman ; Birch Hirschfeld maintains that it arose entirely from a misunderstanding of Chrêtien's text, the French poet describing the Grail as follows :

> 'De fin or esmeree estoit ;
> Pieres pressieuses avoit
> El graal, de maintes manieres,
> Des plus rices et des plus cieres
> Qui el mont u en tiere soient.'

"But how Wolfram, who, in other instances appears to have understood his French source correctly, here came to represent an object of gold, adorned with *many* precious stones, as *a* precious stone, does not appear . . . and it is impossible to identify the stone of the Grail with any known jewel." Again, in her introduction : "Wolfram's presentment of the Grail differs *in toto* from any we find elsewhere ; with him it is not the cup of the Last Supper, but a precious stone endowed with magical qualities" ; to which I should add that Wolfram *nowhere* alludes to this stone as having erst adorned the rebel angel's diadem.

Neither is it with Wolfram "the cup wherein the Redeemer's blood was gathered," nor does he once call it "Der heilige Gral," but merely "der Gral," though he often speaks of it as "pure," "wondrous," and so on. Not even as a "vessel" of any kind does he describe it, but simply as "a stone," or "that thing men call the Grail" : by him and his alleged source, "Kiot the Provençal," it plainly was not conceived as of any *definite* form or substance. This very amorphousness of Wolfram's "Gral," coupled with his story of its bringing to Earth by angels, is of considerable moment, as pointing to a meteorite for origin ; such 'stones fallen from the heavens' having been objects of worship in many regions and at all ages, until the science of the last hundred years accorded them at once belief and rational explanation. But, the real Grail problem being far too intricate to deal with here, I must refer the reader to Mr Nutt's

illuminating *Studies on the Legend of the Holy Grail* (1888) and Miss Weston's translation aforesaid; more especially to the latter.

That "holy cup" formed from "a jewel that dropped out of Lucifer's crown" not figuring in the text of Wolfram's *Parzival*, whence can Pss Carolyne have derived it? Obviously from the loose presentment of a writer who should have known better, namely from the "**Parcival**, *Rittergedicht von Wolfram von Eschenbach, Im Auszuge mitgetheilt von San Marte*," pubd Magdeburg 1832. As the very sub-title denotes, San Marte (alias Albert Schulz) gives mere "extracts" from Wolfram's poem;* these he unites into a connected story by means of a very free paraphrase, so free that he even tampers with his model's facts without affording any indication that he is substituting a version of his own—a most reprehensible procedure for a first unearther. Thus, in midst of the narrative of his "book V."—for he preserves his source's divisions—he tells us that "*The holy Grail* is a stone of the most wondrous and mysterious kind. A number of angels having remained neutral and inactive during the battle of Lucifer and the rebel angels against God and the faithful heavenly hosts, after Lucifer's fall they were condemned by God to support this stone, which had dropped from Lucifer's crown, hovering between Heaven and Earth till the hour of redemption of sinful mankind. Then they brought it to Earth, and, formed into a costly vessel, it served for the dish out of which Christ ate the Pascal lamb, and in which Joseph of Arimathea received the Saviour's blood. When Christianity began to spread more toward the West of Europe, at God's command an angel bore the Grail to the young and pious Prince Titurel," and so on.

Elective affinity must have drawn the princess to this jumbled primer, at a time when Simrock's very close translation of the whole of Wolfram's *Parzival*, from ancient German into modern, stood at her disposal (1st ed. 1842). There she would have missed in the text that cup and crown-jewel, but found a long note on the "Myth of the Grail" in Simrock's appendix (quaintly called an Introduction), containing the following: "Information about the nature of the Grail, and why the angels brought it to earth, has been transmitted to us, indeed, but neither in Parzival nor yet in Titurel. 'Sixty-thousand angels who wished to drive God from Heaven,' we read in the Wartburgkrieg, 'had a crown made for Lucifer. When the archangel Michael tore this from Lucifer's head, a stone sprang loose from it, and that stone is the Grail.'" Now, that *Wartburgkrieg* (adapted by Wagner for act ii of his *Tannhäuser*) was written by a far inferior poet some fifty years after the death of Wolfram, who figures as one of its chief characters, and into whose mouth is put this fanciful tale.

* Four years later Schulz issued a first integral translation of it.

It was most uncritical of San Marte, in the first instance, to interpolate it into Wolfram's own account, and we can therefore appreciate Wagner's agony of mind when he found the said "remarks" foisted on himself, as we have every reason to believe that he was well acquainted not only with the strict translation, but also with Simrock's scholarly notes.*

Why do I fasten this impertinent gloss so confidently on the poor princess? But is it not obvious? We meet the same remark about Lucifer's crown in the *Lohengrin et Tannhäuser* even after Wagner had expunged it from the German version of the Carolysztian *Lohengrin* analysis that appeared in the *Illustrirte*, which Liszt himself had surely perused. A note of this nature is scarcely the thing an Intendant would add of his own free motion; whilst it is inconceivable that any native literary friend of Liszt's (Franz Müller, for instance) should have airily quoted Wolfram from a mere story-book, when the original was doubly accessible. As for Liszt himself, antiquarian research was not in his line, nor does he ever shew much interest in German poets. The princess alone remains.—Much the same must be said about the spear and peacock's feathers in the woodcut, since Carolyne had a pretty taste alike in pictures and symbology. Wagner's hero, not having brought his horse with him, has no use for a lance; whereas the badge of Wolfram's Grail-knights, as known well enough, was a snow-white dove. Whence the peacock-plumage then? From the hat worn by Anfortas, at the beginning of Wolfram's book V, when in mufti as the "Rich Fisher"!—Beyond that we will not bully this too clever lady, as there is no ground to suppose that she had anything to do with the proof-correcting; whereby there hangs a second tale.

Wagner had repeatedly begged that great care should be taken with this earliest issue of his poem; and reasonably, too. July 2, 1850, eight weeks before the première, he writes Liszt: "Concurrently with this, I am sending you a textbook freshly revised for the printer: it will come by goods-post ["Fahrpost," probably taking two or three days longer than a letter]. With regard to this book I have the following to beg you: sell it, or—if you can get nothing for it—make it a present to some publisher who will get it up nicely—at least as well as the book of Tannhäuser," and so on. Liszt replies, without date, that Zigesar will answer Wagner direct about the sale of the libretto (presumably its retailing to the audience) and has already asked Brockhaus to print it. Manifestly Brockhaus declined—so like a relative!—since the book bears the Weimar court-imprint. Zigesar, whose letters have not descended to us, thus seems to have become responsible for its general turn-out. But Wagner is not content with that. Aug. 16

* Cf. iii, 490. Simrock's position as regards "Kiot the Provençal" is another matter: nowadays Kiot is *not* regarded as a mere figment of Wolfram's brain.

he writes Liszt: "In your last letter you forgot to answer me about the textbook: I wrote you that I should much desire to look through a pull of it. Probably it would be too late now, and therefore futile to repeat the wish in that form; instead, however, I entreat you to arrange for the correction being done as carefully as possible: perhaps Professor Wolff himself—to whom I send a thousand hearty greetings [*cf.* 278 *ant.*]—would be so kind as to look over a proof?—Which reminds me that I have probably amended a grammatical slip in the manuscript of the textbook, but not yet in the score. In Lohengrin's last farewell words to Elsa, instead of '*mein* zürnt der Gral wenn ich noch bleib'—it must be '*mir* zürnt' etc." A sort of postscript (letter 38) is added to this, as, immediately after closing it, a doubt crosses Wagner's mind as to the receipt by Liszt of "my last letter, which I sent you about 18 days back," containing among other things that request for a proof. Whether the said letter was ever received by Liszt, one cannot say: perhaps not, as it does not appear in the first edition of the *Briefwechsel* (1887); but how and where it was discovered thereafter, we are not informed by the editor of the *Bayr. Blätter*, who preludes its publication in 1900 with the remark that it was presented to Wahnfried "neither in the original nor out of family property" (Wittgenstein?), leaving us to infer that it is a copy from the acquisition of some autograph-collector. As it necessarily is not included in the most recent English edition of that *Correspondence* (1896) I append a full translation:—

"Zurich, 1. Aug. 50.

"DEAR LISZT!

"Herewith I send you one bar more for Lohengrin, and be so good as to insert it in the score and parts—third act, last scene—immediately after the skip I indicated to you [July 2—*vid. inf.*].

"Astonishing, how stupid one sometimes is! The two bars of *ritournel* after the close of Lohengrin's narration never sounded right to me: I have broken my head for years—and after all, it suddenly occurs to me that there is merely *a bar too little* here. As soon, then, as Lohengrin has said:

'*Sein Ritter ich bin Lohengrin ge(nannt!*'

will come the 3 bars here enclosed, whilst the 2 bars in the score (p. 365) of course drop out.

"Dearest friend, I earnestly beg you to cause a proof of the textbook to be sent me here before printing! There certainly is time still: if one sends it me *sous bande* by post, 10 days will cover the whole delay. I've suffered so much by misprints before, that this time I should like to make perfectly certain!—

"I enclose a letter for Herr v. Zigesar: it contains nothing beyond

a word of thanks for the letter I last received with yours. (He has sent me no money yet: but to him I naturally don't mention that!)

"Write me soon again, you best of friends! You'll give me huge delight, if you do! Kindest regards—left and right—and remain fond of

Your

"(Zum Abendstern. Enge—Zürich.) RICHARD WAGNER."

The plea for despatch of a proof should have hardly been needed; such a courtesy to the author one might fancy a matter of course. But even supposing the thought to have dawned on nobody at Weimar, and supposing the letter of Aug. 1 to have gone astray in the post (as seems quite likely), that of Aug. 16 would arrive a good week before the public performance, and thus allow ample time for a thorough 'revise' of the textbook by some competent person at Weimar. Was that effected? Let us see.

Sept. 9, 1850, under a fortnight after the Weimar production, Wagner writes Intendant Zigesar: "On my return from a little trip into the Alps I found your kind consignment of copies of the textbook of my Lohengrin awaiting me, and had every reason to rejoice at the flattering care with which you have had the same got up." With a good conscience he could say so much, as the *Ausstattung*, or general "get up," is considerably better than that of the usual 'book of words,' and there were far more serious matters to be settled now (see vol. iii and the Battle of the Cuts). But to Liszt he had written the day before: "Let the singers assemble and read their rôles aloud from the printed textbooks (in which, alas! there are many misprints)." Numerically speaking, if one overlooks the frequent substitution of a capital for a 'lowercase' letter at the beginning of a line, there are not so "many"; but what there are, are pretty bad. Even the said substitution—evidently due to the compositor's difficulty in forgetting an old usage of printed verse—occasionally fogs the meaning, as in Ortrud's "dass nicht ein Unheil dich umgarne [mentally one supplies a full stop] Lass mich für dich zur Zukunft schau'n." Worse are the errors that involve a note of exclamation:—Friedrich in act ii is made to *ask* Ortrud "Ha! Dann begriff' ich sein Verbot?" instead of shewing by a "!" that her words have explained what had previously puzzled him. Elsa's "wie schauerlich und klagend ertönt mein Name durch die Nacht?" does not convey the same sense as when the "wie" has a capital and the "Nacht" ends on "!" Her "Ist dies nur Liebe!" to Lohengrin, act iii—should clearly proclaim itself a question; whilst the substitution of "!" for the second comma in "O, wär' es so, und dürft' ich's wissen," makes her positively express a *wish* that harm may be awaiting her husband should his name be made known.—Small points, these, to the intelligent reader; but

unfortunately the average opera-goer does not bring an overwhelming weight of intuition to bear on his perusal of a text.

Of erroneous words or lines, on the other hand, we have just half a dozen:—The Herald in act i is made to say "Durch bösen Zaubers *Licht* und Trug" and "Gott richtet *auch* nach Recht und Fug," where the words I have italicised represent "List" and "euch." Ortrud in act ii is given "Ha, nein! wohl brächte ihm es schlimme Noth, der kluge Held die Frage *drob* verbot!" where the true version has a capital in "wohl," a semicolon after "Noth" and "drum" in place of "drob"; which makes some difference. Friedrich in act ii, "durch eines *Zauber's* List seid ihr belogen" in lieu of "Zaubrer's": the same confusion prevails in the alternative readings of "welches Zauber's Rath" in the fifth scene of act ii *Gtdg;** but in the *Lohengrin* instance Friedrich's accusation is robbed of half its sting if he be made to complain of a "spell" instead of a "sorcerer." A little later he says to Elsa, in the Weimar book, "*die Treu* soll nie er dir von hinnen geh'n"; a line clotted to nonsense by the misprinting of what should be "dir treu,". In act iii Elsa's "Voll Zauber ist dein *Nahen*," instead of "Wesen," is the more to be regretted as it does make sense; but, seeing that the word should rhyme with "genesen" of two lines farther, one is inclined to question the proof-reader's ear. Very bad is the last on my list, where, speaking of the nation's foe, the King is made to observe: "Aus seinen *Oeden oft* daher soll er sich nimmer wagen mehr!" in which the "n" should be "m" and the next two words "öden Ost"; the incompatibility of "oft" with "never" might surely have been noticed ere the unhappy public was offered this conundrum.

Two interpolations remain to be dealt with. The first is a small one, occurring in Lohengrin's second question to Elsa (act i), "Wenn ich im Kampfe für dich siege, willst du *wohl*, dass ich dein Gatte sei?" Coming so early as the fourth page of the book, it was a bad omen, testifying against the proof-corrector's sense of rhythm; thus excluding all possibility of Prof. Wolff (of Jena) having been entrusted with the task, as Wagner had suggested. The second interpolation is vastly more important, if "interpolation" I may term a passage which, simultaneously with the despatch of his MS. text to Weimar, the author had expressly directed to be excised alike from score and book. "One solitary cut I hereby indicate to you myself," he wrote Liszt July 2, "and in fact insist on; namely, the omission of the second part of Lohengrin's narration in the big closing scene of act three. After Lohengrin's words 'sein Ritter ich bin Lohengrin

* The editions checked by Wagner himself, namely of *Siegfried's Tod* in his *Ges. Schr.* ii and *Götterdämmerung* in *Ges. Schr.* vi, have "Zauber's"; the textbooks and printed scores, on the other hand, give "Zaubrer's."

ge' (nannt) 56 whole bars are to be dropped, down to 'wo ihr mit Gott mich alle landen'—('saht'). Thus—'nannt' in lieu of 'saht.'—I have declaimed the whole thing often to myself, and convinced myself that this second division of the narrative is bound to produce a chilling impression. This passage must therefore be omitted from the textbooks, also, forthwith." Well, assuming that letter of Aug. 1 to have been lost (see above), the postscript of Aug. 16 recapitulates its principal contents: "1. a letter of mine to Zigesar.—2. one bar of music (score) to be inserted at the close of Lohengrin's narration, Act III. (Regarding the abridgment I wish for this scene—dropping the second part of the narration—you also say nothing: I presume you agree to it.)—3. My request for despatch of a proof of the textbook (already too late).—If you *haven't* received that letter, I beg you to acquaint me in the utmost haste, since in that event I should wish to send you the said *additional bar* again,* which could still arrive in time for the dress-rehearsal." And yet, after all this insistence of the author's, the *whole* narration is said to have been sung at Weimar! At anyrate, contrary to his express instructions from the outset, it appeared in at least the earliest batch of official textbooks, whence I reproduce it for the curious:—

sein Ritter ich—bin Lohengrin genannt.

Alle Männer und Frauen

(*voll höchsten Staunen's auf ihn blickend*).

Wie wunderbar ist er zu schau'n!
Uns fasst vor ihm ein sel'ges Grau'n.

Lohengrin.

Nun höret noch, wie ich zu euch gekommen!—
Ein klagend Tönen trug die Luft daher,
daraus im Tempel wir sogleich vernommen,
dass fern wo eine Magd im Drangsal wär'.
Als wir den Gral zu fragen nun beschickten,
wohin ein Streiter zu entsenden sei,—
da auf der Fluth wir einen Schwan erblickten,
zu uns zog einen Nachen er herbei.
Mein Vater, der erkannt des Schwanes Wesen,
nahm ihn in Dienste nach des Grales Spruch:—
Denn wer ein Jahr nur seinem Dienst erlesen,
dem weicht von dann ab jedes Zaubers Fluch.
Zunächst nun sollt' er mich dahin geleiten,
woher zu uns der Klage Rufen kam,—
denn durch den Gral war ich erwählt zum Streiten,
darum ich muthig von ihm Abschied nahm.

* It is given, though not *full* score, in letter 24 to Uhlig.

Durch Flüsse und durch wilde Meereswogen
hat mich der treue Schwan dem Ziel genaht,
bis er zu euch an's Ufer mich gezogen,
*wo ihr in Gott mich alle landen saht.**

Prose must suffice to render these verses, which hardly rank among the poet's highest efforts. The two-line chorus, regarding the hero with utmost amaze, exclaims, "How wonderful he is to look on! Sweet awe assails us at the sight!" Whereupon Lohengrin proceeds to tell the manner of his coming :—"To that distant temple the winds bore the cry of a maid in distress; while sending to ask the Grail whither to despatch a champion, on the waters we beheld a swan drawing a boat towards us. My father, divining the swan's true nature, took it into service at the Grail's command; for whoso is elect to serve It but a year, is freed from every evil spell. So, first

---

* Without the two-line chorus dividing them from what now constitutes his whole narration, these verses of Lohengrin's have also been reproduced in the *Bayreuther Taschen-Kalender* for 1894, in course of an article entitled "Paralipomena zu Lohengrin" and signed "R. S." There the "Drangsal" of line 4 is preceded by "*im*," not "in," thus evidencing another small Weimar misprint. Moreover, line 6 of the *B.T.K.* version has "*Ritter*" for "Streiter," l. 14 "*Hilfe*" for "Klage," l. 15 "*zu streiten*" for "zum Streiten," and l. 19 "*daher*" before "*ans Ufer*"; but these are manifestly variants of Wagner's own (*vid. sup.* "freshly revised"), since the *B.T.K.'s* source is much older than the Zurich-Weimar period, namely the autograph "first sketches" for the music of *Lohengrin*, now in the possession of Herr Adolf von Gross of Bayreuth — though I should add that the *B.T.K.'s* evidence is second-hand, derived from a reproduction in the Stuttgart *Neue Musik-Zeitung*. From this article we also learn that the musical themes employed in the discarded "56 bars" of the score were those of the Grail, Forbiddal, and Swan, ending, as now, with that of the hero; also that those 56 bars have been executed at least twice within recent years, namely under Klindworth at a concert of the Berlin Wagner-Verein Nov. 1888, and under Hermann Levi at the Tonkünstler-Versammlung in Munich May '93.—The words for Gottfried were quoted in my vol. ii, 156; the only further variant mentioned in the *B.T.K.* is that of the Herald's opening speech, which in these "sketches" runs thus: "*Ihr, Edle, Volk und Freie von Brabant, hört an!—Heinrich, der Deutschen König kam zu Euch, um, so ihr Klage zu erheben oder Streit zu schlichten habt, Getreu zu richten und Recht zu sprechen dem, dem Recht gebührt,*" whereupon the chorus answers simply "*Willkommen, König, in Brabant.*" Of greater interest is it to learn from this source that, instead of the 13 bars now modulating from the A major of the prelude to the C major of the Königsruf (Royal call), in the "sketch" the scene began with 7 bars B flat conducting to a three-bar fanfare, repeated at end of the Herald's proclamation, which has not found its way into the finished work at all; *after* that repetition came the present Königsruf, but in the key of D.

it was to guide me thither whence the cry had come; for me, it was, the Grail had chosen champion, and stout of heart I bade to It farewell. Down streams and through seas' raging billows the faithful swan conducted me, till to your shore he drew me nigh, where in God's name ye all have seen me land."

Not for an instant can we doubt that Wagner was right in cancelling those lines. They take one away from the actual situation quite unnecessarily, since wellnigh all the information they add to that suggested in act i is sufficiently outlined in the rest of this scene. The crux of the whole Lohengrin plot is the revelation of his origin and name; that once divulged, further epic details could but "produce a chilling impression," as the dramatist observes, and one's only wonder is that he and his "critical friend" of Dresden should have failed to make that discovery at a much earlier date. Decidedly it ought *not* to have appeared in the Weimar textbooks at all, if it was not sung there; still more decidedly ought it not to have been sung there, after the author's prohibition. On both points Liszt maintains a stubborn silence, unless we are to assume that a letter of *his* to Wagner, about this epoch, has not come down to us—an assumption for which there is no visible ground. Wagner, on the contrary, remarks in his of Sept. 8: "With exception of the second part of Lohengrin's narration in the last act (which from the very beginning I wanted cut) I wish my opera to be given exactly as it stands"; from which we may conclude that Carl Ritter had already reported to him the non-fulfilment of this repeatedly-desired omission. However that may be, there stands the forbidden passage in a textbook no proof whereof was submitted to its author; taken in conjunction with the prefatory interpolation and the various misprints, one therefore feels that young Ritter had solid ground for those outspoken criticisms on the production in general that goaded Liszt to his ironical "*suspect—guillotiné*" (iii, 56). I have previously remarked that the *dramatic* side of opera was not Liszt's forte, that he was too much the musician *pur et simple;* also that he was a most careless reader of the written word: this neglect of his friend's express directions fully bears out my contention. It is noteworthy, however, that albeit he offers no sort of excuse for the errors &c. in the printed text of Wagner's work, when it becomes a question of the respect due to Carolyne's he is scrupulosity itself; in his letter of Sept. 25, regarding their projected joint article on *Lohengrin* (need I repeat that he calls it *his?*), we read: "In the event of a German publication, I should absolutely insist on your taking the trouble to translate it yourself, and to have it copied under your own eyes, so as not to burden my responsibility with idiocies of the translator, etc., etc."

One point more, and my growl is at an end. In vol. iii (p. 56) I observed that Ortrud's menacing gesture &c. was omitted at Weimar

"through sheer ignorance." That charitable interpretation I drew from Wagner's letter of Sept. 8, '50 (to Liszt), where he attributes the omission to a "perhaps quite accidental neglect of a direction in the score; out of which I particularly wanted all similar instructions to be copied for the performers." Unfortunately there was no possibility of such excuse, since this "direction" stands printed in the Weimar textbook itself,—Wagner having added nothing whatever to his very ample stage-directions when the poem of *Lohengrin* appeared in *Ges. Schr.* ii. What importance he attached to that gesture, may be gathered from the said letter: "The public must be given the impression that only by a supreme effort had Elsa just overcome her doubt, and that we really have to fear—now she once has yielded to speculations about Lohengrin—she will succumb in the end, and transgress the prohibition. In the rousing of this general presentiment lies the sole necessity for *a third act to follow*, in which our fears are fufilled."

It would be the height of ingratitude, to underrate Liszt's services in the cause of his comrade's *music*, at least in the first years of the fifties; but these little facts must be remembered when we find Wagner giving vent, from time to time, to such expressions as the following, "That I virtually *gave up* my Lohengrin, when I permitted its performance at Weimar, you surely need no telling" (to Uhlig, Sept. 20, 50), and those already quoted from the letters to Schindelmeisser. To Liszt himself his friend of course uttered no like reproach, since he fully realised Liszt's limitations: passing lightly over what was irremediable, or suggesting remedies for Liszt's stage-associates to carry out, he is untiring in thanks to his musical champion, thanks the sincerity whereof is proved by their reflection in converse with others, for the boon his labours had in truth conferred.

Pages 267*n*, 308*n* and 312*n*. WAGNER AND THE BERLIN COURT-THEATRE.—A few weeks after issue of vol. iii of the present biography that admirable German half-monthly *Die Musik* (founded Oct. 1901) published in its issues for March to May 1903 a series of articles, headed "Richard Wagner und die Berliner General-Intendatur," by Dr Wilhelm Altmann of Berlin, who prefaces them with thanks to the recently-demitted Intendant Count Hochberg for sanction to make researches bearing on "the history of the Berlin Opera in the 19th century" in the "Registratur" of his theatre. Dr Altmann remarks that "the acts concerning Richard Wagner furnish an exhaustive picture only of the negotiations re the 'Fliegender Holländer' and 'Tannhäuser.'" How exhaustive, the reader may judge when I inform him that the *Holländer* section alone covers a dozen large quarto pages of the magazine, mostly small type, and wellnigh entirely composed of matter not hitherto made known. It is far too late in the chronicle, for me now to deal at all fully with that portion:

perhaps some future occasion may provide the opportunity. Here I will merely state that the textbook first sent to Berlin (July '41) was in "one act, three curtains,"* and quote the letter wherein Meyerbeer addresses the then Intendant, Graf Wilhelm von Redern, on the young composer's behalf:—

"Right honourable Count,

I take the liberty of sending you herewith the score and text (the latter will be found inserted behind the title-page) of the opera 'Der fliegende Holländer' by Richard Wagner. I have already had the honour, the day before yesterday, to speak to Your Excellency about this interesting composer, who doubly deserves, through his talent and his extremely straitened circumstances, that the great court-theatres, as official protectors of German art, should not close their doors to him.

"Your Excellency had also the kindness to promise me that you would notify me [a lapsus calami for "him"?] by a few lines of your receipt of the score and your willingness to examine it. Permitting myself to recall this to your memory, I have at the same time the honour etc.

"9. December 41. [signed] MEYERBEER."

Prior to this, Wagner had sent Count Redern a long letter dated June 27, '41 (followed in a few days by the first textbook), and Nov. 20 had written the same gentleman again, "I permit myself herewith to send Your Excellency the complete score of the said opera 'Der fliegende Holländer' together with the textbook," etc., etc. This has led Dr Altmann to suppose that Redern passed on the score to Meyerbeer†

---

* The report of Regisseur K. A. Freiherr von Lichtenstein, dated Aug. 2, 41, calls it, "Der 'Fliegende Holländer,' romantische Oper in 1 Akte und drei Aufzügen," evidently quoting the title-page. In ordinary parlance "Akt" and "Aufzug" mean the same, but Lichtenstein's report emphasises Wagner's distinction here, by stating that "the author requires the opera to be played in one sole act (*nur in einem Akte*) without interruption with musical interludes" (no commas to guide us). In a subsequent report (Henning and Lichtenstein, Jan. 8, 42) on the completed score itself, the description "1 Akt" is omitted, but Lichtenstein "rejoices indeed that the author has abandoned the idea of letting his work appear in one act (*Aufzug*), but [Ln] cannot agree that the three acts (*Aufzüge*) should be played without interruption and merely separated by brief musical interludes"; Lichtenstein's objections, duly set forth, are of a practical nature.

† Certainly, if that "notify me" is *not* a slip of the pen by M.'s amanuensis, it looks as if some plan of action had been preconcerted at the interview of "the day before yesterday"; and it is strange that, though Wagner's letter to R. is of Nov. 20, Meyerbeer's is so late as Dec. 9. Should there have really

for his opinion ; but I think it is clear from the above that Wagner himself had sent score, text and letter of Nov. 20 c/o Meyerbeer, begging him to hand them to Redern, and that Meyerbeer had first spent a day or two in looking through the music (see also vol. i, 332). In pursuance of Meyerbeer's request, Redern wrote Wagner Dec. 14,'41 : "I have the honour to inform you that textbook and score of your opera have safely arrived, and have been particularly recommended by Herr Hofkapellmeister Meyerbeer.* After text and music shall have been examined according to regulations I will not fail to acquaint you with the issue of the affair, as I shall devote to it my genuine interest." The opera was then submitted to Kapellmeister Henning and Regisseur von Lichtenstein for their report (rendered Jan. 8), but not definitely accepted till March 14, 1842. Unluckily, Count Redern was transferred almost immediately thereafter to the newly-created post of Generalintendant of the *court*-music, and von Küstner succeeded him as Intendant of the theatre. Küstner, however, confirms the acceptance on June the first, though he "can fix no date as yet" for the performance. The *Dutchman* was not produced in Berlin until *nineteen* months afterwards (see vol. ii), in spite of Wagner's continual petitions ; in none of which, significantly enough, is any allusion made to Meyerbeer's advocacy. Meanwhile Meyerbeer had been appointed General-Musikdirektor June 11, 1842, only ten days after Küstner's entry into office ; so that the new Intendant fell at once under his influence, and had Meyerbeer chosen to exert it again in Wagner's behalf, he undoubtedly could have. We are perfectly justified, then, in holding him to some extent accountable for the delay ; especially when we learn that Redern has against his own will to *return* to Wagner in 1846 certain arrangements of *Tannhäuser* for the band of the Guards, and that Küstner sends back the full score of that work Sept. 11, '47, on the very eve of Wagner's royal-commanded arrival in Berlin to prepare *Rienzi* for production there (cf. ii, 200-5).

As to Herr Botho von Hülsen, the *Dutchman* had long since vanished from the Berlin repertory when he succeeded Küstner June 1, 1851. December 1868 he revived it at last, and Dr Altmann now gives us the pleasing intelligence that "Herr von Hülsen was also so generous as to grant supplementary tantièmes to Wagner, who

---

been some hocus-pocus here, it would explain Wagner's astonishing remark in his (pseudonymous) news-letter of Feb. 5, '42, to the *Neue Zeitschrift*, "no sly, deliberate *filou* like M.," also an enigmatic clause in his first letter to Küstner (May 17, '42), "under the prevailing circumstances, which must sooner or later come to public knowledge" (*Die Musik*, March 1903, p. 341).

* This honorary title had been conferred on Meyerbeer in 1832 (so Altmann tells us), in consideration of the success of the Berlin production of *Robert*.

originally had sold the performing-right of the 'Holländer' to the Berlin Opera for 100 ducats, and to write off that sum as merely a kind of advance on account of the tantièmes"—a most unusual act of justice.* Personally, then, von Hülsen was not half so black as he has hitherto been painted. Bearing that in mind as a token of character, though it is still in the dim lap of the future for all that Wagner knows of it, we will proceed to the composer's first letter to Hülsen (Oct. 1852) after various pourparlers re *Tannhäuser* had been carried on between them through the intermediation of brother Albert and niece Johanna. In vol. iii (p. 384) we heard Wagner say to Liszt about this letter, "I have made it completely an affair of the heart between him and me, just as it is between ourselves," and again, "At last I wrote Hülsen himself, as perspicuously, impressively, as heartily and stirringly, as ever I am able." That this description was in nowise exaggerated, any peruser of the subjoined will certainly admit :—

"Right honourable Herr General-Intendant,

It is no longer possible for me to refrain from addressing myself personally to you.† Through the decision you have made

---

* Since the above was written, the *Allg. Musik-Ztg* (Oct. 9, 1903) has published a letter from Wagner to Franz Betz (the first Hans Sachs and Bayreuth Wotan) dated August 8, 1868, containing among other things (cf 400 *ant.*) the following passage : "The 'Fliegender Holländer' was given in the year 1844, four times altogether (in the Playhouse, as the Operahouse was then in course of reconstruction), immediately before the introduction of the tantième system, and for the then customary fee of 100 ducats [about £46]. Now, if the opera is to be revived after 24 years—and in the Operahouse—it certainly is to be regarded as, and the management also intends it to be, a novelty. . . . So, though Herr v. H. might be formally in the right if he wanted to resume the opera without tantième for me, yet the moral wrong he would thereby inflict on me is plain as day, and it really would not well beseem the most important court-theatre's character for handsome business-dealings.—Consequently I should be glad if you would impress on Herr v. H. how much he would oblige me, and what an appreciable act of justice he would perform, if he waived that legal vantage over me and only revived the 'Fliegender Holländer' after guaranteeing me the tantième that has since become the rule with all my works. The 100 ducats would then have to be reckoned, let us say, as my tantième for those first 4 performances."

† Dr Altmann italicises (or rather, spaces) the last three words, in his reproduction ; but unfortunately he confesses to having thus treated whatever struck him as of more particular novelty or interest in these documents, so that we are left in the dark as to the original underlinings. Wherefore I have employed italics very sparingly in my translation of them, rejecting every mark of emphasis but what my own experience of the author's custom can conscientiously endorse.

and adhered to under such difficult circumstances,* to produce my 'Tannhäuser,' you have given me so astonishing a proof of an unusual disposition (*Gesinnung*) that I consider it foolish to remain in any manner of diffidence in respect of the latter. In such a diffident mood I was at first, when I repeatedly thought necessary to make sure of your true intention through this or that proposed condition; now that your undaunted perseverance in the scheme has taught me the inadmissibility of every doubt, I hold it a vital duty toward myself outspokenly to lay to your heart my actual wish regarding that production. Had I expressed that wish to you at once, I might have spared myself all other stipulations, probably very much to the advantage of your opinion of me. It torments me now, to think that I have done the wrong thing, and omitted—out of intimate considerations—the only thing sufficient for me. Fortunately my trust in you has meanwhile had so much cause to increase, that I believe I may now venture to retrieve the omission. Permit me a brief rationale of this wish of mine.

"After my experiences with German theatres, I had already quite abandoned the hope of seeing my dramatic works still spread among them: single attempts here and there did not affect me in this resignation. With your magnanimous resolve, to institute a production of 'Tannhäuser' in Berlin, my dejection of a sudden altered: so great and decisive importance do I attach to the success of this undertaking, however, that I now make everything, my whole future artistic activity, depend on it alone. A conclusive success of my 'Tannhäuser' in Berlin has now become the crucial question of my whole further artistic existence. Judge, then, if my care about it must be great!—Well, according to my plain experiences of the essence of the thing, the whole issue hangs on that person who, as representative of the poet and composer, is to summon his work into actual life through its performance: in the paramount instance this is the Conductor. A work of the *most impugned new style* can in reality be brought to a representation in entire accord with his intentions solely by him who created it; in the second line, again, only by someone who completely sympathises with him. Now, I myself am not allowed to assist my work personally to a conclusive birth (such as will happen in Berlin): were this permitted me by other parties, I feel sure you would not entertain the least objection to my conducting the preparations for my opera, as also its first performances; for nobody could think himself slighted in any way by the conceding of that function to

---

* Some opposition is indicated by these words. Its nature would become plain to us, only if we possessed a copy of the previous correspondence between Wagner and his brother or niece; but we have already had a hint of it in his niece's letter to von Lüttichau (iii, 386*n*). Whether it was political, or merely Meyerbeerian, it certainly came from *outside* the theatre.

the poet and composer. Good fortune, however, has bestowed on me a friend the like of whom has rarely yet been granted a man in need of friends: this friend is my second soul; what I feel and can, he feels and can; what he does for me, is as much my own act as if I did it. I speak of one of the most highly-gifted artists of our age, once rapturously acclaimed in Berlin itself, and dear to me above all else, *Franz Liszt*. To him alone I owe it that my artist-name exists to-day, that I still have hopes of my artistic produce, and in particular that the existence of this 'Tannhäuser'—to which you have now so handsomely addressed your interest—could so much as come within your ken. If, then, I express to you my strongest wish that you may be pleased to transfer to my friend Liszt precisely the same rights you would accord the author in respect of the production of his work—imagine *what* you would effect by fulfilling that wish! To myself you would be giving the full assurance that my work will be rendered completely in my spirit and as none else but myself could have accomplished: to my friend you would give the finest satisfaction for his most self-sacrificing efforts to gain my works acknowledgment; you would make it possible for him to crown his deed of friendship, begun amid such overwhelming circumstances and pursued with tireless energy, with the acme of achievement; you would be giving him the reward I am too feeble to pay his affectionate ambition.—To yourself, on the other hand, you would guarantee the success of your undertaking, and surely also—for of *our joint* operation I am proud!—a pleasure of uncommon kind.

"Liszt is ready to put forth all his strength in obedience to your summons, so soon as you should kindly invite him, at my desire, to fill my place in Berlin; as my second self to guide the production of 'Tannhäuser' with the same plenary authority you would gladly devolve on myself beyond doubt, and to take up his abode in *Berlin* from the beginning of the rehearsals onward (for that matter, purely for his own gratification). I know, in fact, that the said invitation would highly delight him.

"Now, right honourable Herr Generalintendant, what haply might stand in the way? Certainly nothing but regard for the royal Kapellmeister already entrusted with my opera, who, if he failed to grasp the situation, perhaps might feel aggrieved. On this point, then, I am bound to treat you with the fullest candour. On Kapellmeister *Dorn* I can *not* bestow the confidence I need in a cause of such moment to me. High as I rate Dorn's knowledge and abilities, I cannot credit him—and I know him fairly well—with that congenial warmth towards myself, my work and my art in general,* whereof I

* In 1843 Dorn had mutilated the *Holländer* past recognition, at Riga; see ii, 33*n*.

have need ; he may *believe* he understands me, but I *know* he cannot. Moreover, between Dorn and myself in bygone days things came to a rupture that makes it impossible for either of us to approach the other now with needful intimacy : it is impossible for us to exchange letters.* So much for one side. On the other, Dorn should really be the last to take it ill, if a special occasion called for his shewing his regard and attachment to *Liszt*, as he is bound to gratitude towards the latter for a great service (he had to thank him for his summoning from far-off Riga to Cologne). But should the contingence make him touchy notwithstanding, and should he not care to conduct the later performances—after Liszt—I am firmly convinced that my friend Taubert [the senior Kplmstr] would willingly consent to relieve him once for all. This change could but be altogether favourable to me in any case, as Kapellmeister Taubert is on familiar terms with me,† and with him I could place myself in very successful agreement as to everything needful.

"In the above I have poured you out my heart without reserve. With your purpose to represent 'Tannhäuser,' particularly in present circumstances, you have undertaken something *extra-ordinary ;* may

---

* To Dorn's half-brother L. Schindelmeisser three weeks previously (Sept. 29) : "Dorn is said—as is written me—to be much interesting himself for Tannhäuser in Berlin. I don't at all know how I actually stand with him ; at Riga he ended by shewing himself a not thoroughly straightforward friend to me. Well, it's long since I've got over my grudge for that ; only, it made me shy of him, and as yet no altogether solid ground is offered me for combating that shyness ; so that it apparently is my misfortune to seem to him more unforgiving than I really am. Perhaps you can give me news of your brother one day—in memory of Reichel's Garden at Leipzig?"—see also 318 *ant.*

† "Mir vertraut" perhaps rather overstates their relations at this date, as we never hear anything of Taubert in the post-Dresden correspondence. Presumably Wagner made his acquaintance during a visit to Berlin at the end of 1845 for the purpose of advocating *Tannhäuser* (ii, 117), since in April 1846 he thanks Taubert for a loan of the parts of the Ninth Symphony (ii, 125*n*) ; in 1847 also, T. must have assisted in the preparation of *Rienzi*. The bygone kindness would justify his description as a "friend," but Bülow's evidence suffices to shew that Taubert had no more affection for Wagner than Dorn.—I cannot resist quoting a delicious characterisation from the staid and judicial *Grove's Dict.* : "One of those sound and cultivated artists who contribute so much to the solid musical reputation of Germany. . . . Mendelssohn seems to have put his finger on the want of strength and spirit which, with all his real musicianlike qualities, his refined taste and immense industry, has prevented Taubert from writing anything that will be remembered. The list of his published works is an enormous one. . . . In this country Taubert is almost unknown."

it therefore not alarm you, if my own attitude towards this undertaking should overstep the bounds of the habitual! Already I am deeply and sincerely obliged to you: can there remain aught else for you to do, then, but proceed to the end of the road you so generously have trodden for my best good, and make me *your most grateful debtor* with all my hopes for my artistic future?

"If I may beg you for a definite answer, please address it to *Liszt* himself at Weimar: through him I should learn the nicest whether you fulfil my wish.

"With the greatest respect and esteem I remain, Herr General-Intendant,

Yours
very faithfully
"Zurich, 17. October 1852. RICHARD WAGNER."

As Dr. Altmann points out, though this letter is plainly dated "17. Oktober" and thus described in Hülsen's answer, Wagner speaks of it in the past tense ("an Herrn von Hülsen entscheidend wegen Deiner Berufung . . . gewendet habe") in a letter which bears the date "13. Okt." in the *W.-L.* Naturally, the latter must be an error of either transcriber or printer, and apparently we ought to read therefor "18. Okt." The point is of small consequence, however, as the said letter to Liszt deals with no other matter of moment, and we already knew that there was an interruption of about a fortnight midway in the writing of the *Rheingold* poem.

Hülsen answers Wagner direct (not Liszt, as requested) Oct. 29, '52:—

"Ew. Wohlgeboren*

expresses in your obliging letter of the 17th inst., conveyed to me through Frl. your niece, the wish that Kapellmeister Herr F. Liszt be permitted to rehearse the opera 'Der Tannhäuser' here.

"Though this has hitherto been allowed the composer himself under any conditions, the wish expressed is a most unusual exception; nevertheless that in itself might be overcome, did it not involve an indescribable affront to the Kapellmeisters serving under me. For this reason I could never consent to it, and must therefore denote your Wohlgeboren's wish as inexecutable. At the same time, however, you do the Kapellmeister Dorn, entrusted with the rehearsing

* An old-fashioned style of formal address, generally translatable as "Sir"; but the construction makes that rendering impossible here, whereas "Your Honour" would be a little too exalted. It will be remembered that Wagner asked Liszt, two years before, to beg the Weimar Intendant to drop "such silly pipe-clay" as "Your Well-bornness etc." (iii, 50*n*).

of your opera, a great injustice; for, whatever your Wohlgeboren's personal relations with him may be, it was precisely *he* who first aroused in me the idea of the possibility of a production of 'Tannhäuser' on the Royal stage at Berlin.

"He will engage in the task with zeal and interest, and, in general, everything will be done to mount your work worthily; apropos whereof, in view of your anxieties, I cannot withhold the remark that many very great and scenically difficult operas, presented here, have enjoyed approval ere this. The peculiarity of our opera-house demands special contrivances, quite different from those e.g. at Dresden, just as the better lighting here requires its own arrangement [indifferently expressed, but testifying to some acquaintance with the *Tannhäuser Guide*].

"As regards the musical execution of your work, those concerned will assuredly do all they can; to expect more, would of course be fallacious.

"The cuts specified by you [denounced in the *Guide?*] are deemed needful with regard to our public.

"Now I hope that Ew. Wohlgeboren will leave the rest to me; the more so, as you yourself acknowledge that nothing save an interest in your work could have prompted me. [signed] HÜLSEN."

Unlike the letters of 1854 to Liszt, the above is decidedly rude, though the Intendant had a perfect right to object to the springing of a fresh condition at the last moment. The one mistake Wagner had made in his eloquent missive, had been the taking of Hülsen into his confidence about Dorn; it was a very natural thing to do, in explanation of his wish for Liszt, but it appears to have frozen Dorn's chief at once—a minor *lèse majesté*—and he seizes the opening for some stinging sarcasm. Indisputably Wagner was therefore right when he bemoaned to Liszt his having met his usual fate again, of pouring his whole soul out against a wall of leather (see iii, 385); yet he is discriminating enough to call Hülsen, almost in the same breath, "a personally quite well-disposed man,"—a point that fully justifies his claim of 1856 (*cf.* 356 *ant.*) that he was by no means a *recent* "convert" to trust in Hülsen's personal character. To what source, then, may we trace the Intendant's access of impoliteness? To Dorn and Wagner's *brother*.

On Hülsen's word we may implicitly rely that, strange as it may seem, it was Dorn who had originally suggested to him the production of *Tannhäuser*. As I have remarked in the body of the text, it is a scrap of a feather in Dorn's cap; no more than a scrap, though, since the great success at Schwerin early in the year had already led to inquiries even from quite minor theatres, and Dorn's half-brother had secured the opera for Wiesbaden before the first overture was made from Berlin (see 474 *ant.*): in such a production there was good hope

of popularity and kudos for the conductor, and we have seen Reissiger himself not above reviving *Tannhäuser* at Dresden to put a spoke in his fellow-Kapellmeister's wheel. Wagner's letter has just reminded us that he and Dorn were not on speaking terms ; yet, if the junior Berlin Kapellmeister had conceived the idea in any spirit of magnanimity, we should have expected him to communicate his intention at least to his own benefactor Liszt. Dorn's generosity thus reduced to a minimum, we may imagine his pique at Wagner's allusion to him ; of which he naturally would hear, if not through Hülsen, at all events through babbling Albert.

As to Albert Wagner's share in the reply, we have the explicit testimony of Dr Altmann, "Out of consideration for Wagner's feelings, before despatching it Herr von Hülsen had shewn this letter to Albert Wagner, in whom he placed full confidence, and to his daughter Johanna, and at their request had subjected it to a few minor alterations." The said "alterations" may perhaps account for the faulty syntax of several sentences, and the prevalence of non-sequitur ; but if Albert Wagner saw anything in this letter's final form to spare his brother's feelings, he must have been singularly thick-skinned himself. In any case, between him, his daughter and their principal, a discourteous refusal was concocted and sent to Richard Wagner ; consequently we need not be surprised that the latter, in his ignorance of the collaboration, preferred to discontinue any direct correspondence with the Intendant, and to return to the medium of those he still took to be his friends, his brother and niece.

Finally, with regard to that niece. How is it that *she* was not the one to suggest to Hülsen the presentation of that very opera in which she, or rather, her uncle had made her name at Dresden? The answer will be found in pages 148-50 and 466 *antea*, also in a later volume. Unfortunately, not one of Richard Wagner's relatives who owned any influence ever rendered him the smallest help. Anti-nepotism could no farther go.

Page 309. DORN'S "NIBELUNGEN" OPERA.—"*DIE NIBELUNGEN*, grand opera in 5 acts by E. Gerber, music by H. Dorn. Represented for the first time at the Weimar Court-theatre the 22nd of January 1854.—**To His Royal Highness the Grand Duke of Saxe-Weimar, Karl Alexander**, the adept Protector of German Art, this work is dedicated as a token of sincere esteem and gratitude by HEINRICH DORN." That, a title-page and its obverse (vocal score, pubd "Berlin, Ed. Bote and J. Bock," without date, but winter 1854-5), is Dorn's riposte to Wagner's unguarded remark about himself. At one stroke he has nobbled his rival's friend, half-patron duke, the "habitation of his art" (*P.* I. 388), the title of his vastest effort, and the once-contemplated personatrix of his chief heroine. In politics such a trick would be branded as

'dishing' the opposition. Where was Liszt's vaunted diplomacy, where his companion's "long view," if they could not see through it? At the end of 1851 Wagner had published to the world his occupation with a four-day musical drama founded on the "Nibelungen-myth, such as it had become my own poetic property" (*ibid.* 390). At the beginning of 1853 we saw private copies of his poem finding their way to Berlin; so that its title, at least, was no longer even an open secret. That title, at all events, should therefore have been avoided like poison by any honourable rival, when far more apt denominations lay ready to his choice. Between the giant and the pigmy "Nibelungen" that title is wellnigh the sole real bond of union: why, then, did Liszt not make one simple stipulation ere acceptance, a stipulation that Dorn's opera should *not* go forth into the world with the Weimar hall-mark on its petty larceny, but be rechristened *Chriemhild* or the like? Can you imagine Goethe 'diplomatically' accepting a "Wallenstein" hotch-potch while Schiller was sweating his life-blood to complete his trilogy? But the Weimar of Karl Alexander was a very different place from that of Karl August: a passion for assorted collections seems to have gained predominance; and long ere Wagner's *Nibelungen* saw the footlights, Hebbel's and Jordan's had been added there to Dorn's.

The first we hear of Dorn's *Nibelungen* is in a letter of Liszt's to L. Köhler dated May 24, 53, two days after his comrade's fortieth birthday: "If you should be staying a few days in Berlin, ask Dorn why he has not yet sent me his score of the *Nibelungen?* Perhaps my letter did not reach him in answer to his, in which he announced the score to me." Those two letters ought to be illuminating, but neither has descended to us; nor, in fact, has any of Liszt's *to* Dorn. Though he positively goes out of his way to secure the competing work, Liszt's intimacy with its composer cannot have been great, since he asks Bülow next November for Dorn's "exact address"; consequently the remark to Köhler by no means proves that Dorn's full score was anywhere near completion in May 53, even if already begun. How the subject was broached, or rather, broken to Wagner, we do not know: probably during Liszt's Zurich visit of July or the Basle to Paris reunion of October; for the first written message to his friend hereon runs baldly thus, Oct. 31, 53: "Until the strict court-mourning is over I have only your two operas, Tell and Dorn's Nibelungen, to conduct" —a strange concatenation indeed, were we not used to Liszt's eclecticism and fondness for a novelty. That he knew absolutely nothing of the merits of Dorn's composition even then, is to be inferred from that composer's remarks of Dec. 4, "I should have answered your kind letter of Nov. 29 earlier,* as the copy of the 1st act of the Nibe-

* Liszt to Bülow, in that letter about the projected Berlin Wagner-concert

lungen was ready a week ago ; but I wished to tell you about Bülow's début last night. . . . Herewith, then, you receive the 1st act of the opera, so that your copyists may have something to begin with . . [dots in the German ed.] . . I have no doubt that you will cast the solo parts as well as possible, and therefore do not trouble my head as to whether Brunhild bears the name of Knop, Bleyel or Schulz. I should prefer a second-rank singer to devote all her powers to this virago, to having it treated negligently by a first, in contrast to the more brilliant Chrimhilde. As for the choruses—I ask no more than all modern composers have asked in the past 25 years ; and what Weimar has done bis dato in this branch will satisfy me too [the Weimar chorus was particularly bad, by Liszt's account]. In general, have no fear that I am spoiled in any way ; at Berlin we cook with water just as elsewhere, and if we excel on the right hand—perhaps we fail on the left!" And so on, in the same cynical strain : a wholly uninspiring letter, by a man who no more believed in his work than the veriest scullion ; a man from whom a dedication to an "adept Protector (*dem Kenner und Beschützer*) of German Art" was a mockery, if not an insult. But the most ominous sign is that "remodelling" of the opera consequent on its two Weimar performances,* coupled with the original attribution to Chriemhild of the leading rôle, as "Brunhild, mezzo soprano" *heads* the list of dramatis personæ in the published vocal score ; plainly the Weimar advice had been to write up this "second-rank" part, and thus make it long enough to tempt Wagner's niece—with whom, as a fact, the opera stood and fell thereafter. Altogether, it was a most dangerous position for Liszt to have placed himself in, unless the Altenburg copy of the Ring-poem were kept under the strictest padlock during the guest's stay there for his opera's repetition.

So fruitful in suggestions had the Weimar confabulations been, that Dorn's letter of thanks Feb. 54 can say : "I now have well-grounded hopes of a complete success at Berlin, and fancy our personnel will not dash them. If you should want to repeat the Nibelungen at Weimar, give me notice, so that I may let you know the latest cuts and variants. Remember me, I beseech you, to the amiable, clever and erudite Princess v. Wittgenstein ; the sojourn in

---

(308 *ant.*) : "I enclose a letter for Dorn, which I beg you to hand him forthwith. It is about his *Nibelungen*, which will be represented here at the end of January. Write me Dorn's exact address."

* Cf 310 *ant.* "Remodelling" is the only interpretation to be set on this clause in Dorn's letter of Feb. 19, 54 : "von welch grossem Nutzen die Weimaraner Aufführung meiner Oper für die Gestaltung und ganze Zukunft derselben gewesen ist."—This letter and that of the previous Dec. 4, by the way, are the only published ones of Dorn to Liszt.

her hospitable house, though brief, will always remain one of the most agreeable memories in my artist-life." For all we know, then, those changes in Dorn's opera's "shaping" (*Gestaltung*) may have largely been due to the amiable princess's "erudition," an erudition steeped in *Siegfried's Tod:* if so, the more the pity that *she* did not suggest a change of title, to obviate invidious comments.* Where was the worldly wisdom of these children of the world when an assault was being planned, with their heedless aid, on a "dear great man's" most intimate possession?

Two months after its trial trip at Weimar, the pirate-ship put into port at Berlin: "Herr Dorn's new opera, *Die Niebelungen*, was produced at the Opera House, on Monday, the 27th, and was quite successful. I will send you a more detailed account when I have heard it again, and am better qualified to judge dispassionately of its merits," writes the Berlin correspondent of the *Mus. World*, Apr. 8, 54; and a week later, "Since my last I have been twice to hear Herr Dorn's new five-act opera *Die Niebelungen*, and am therefore better qualified to give an opinion. The author of the *libretto*, Herr E. Gerber, has not been happy in his subject. The public do not take the same interest in the cold, statue-like personages of the old German epic as for beings of a later period, in harmony with themselves. They admire without sympathy, and hence Herr Dorn has to contend with a great difficulty. His music is not very original, but it has character—without any leaven of French or Italian. Still, it is not likely to attain a lasting popularity. Mdlle. Johanna Wagner exerted herself to the utmost in the principal character, Brunhild, both as a singer and an actress, and was deservedly applauded. The other parts were well sustained by Mdme. Herrenburger, Herren Bost, Theodore Formes, Schäffer and Krüger. The chorus was steady and excellent. The opera is put on the stage magnificently."

That was fifty years ago, and the composer's very name would be forgotten now, were it not for his crossing our hero's path. The latter fact, however, lends his opera's plot a modicum of interest; wherefore I have begged a clever friend to make a summary, which—save for a comment or two within square brackets—I append as it was given me, facetiæ and all, merely premising that the librettist's main outlines (except for act i) seem borrowed from those *Kritische Gänge* of Vischer's which Stahr would have liked Wagner to follow:—

* March 1857 Bülow writes Liszt from Magdeburg, where he has arrived to play at a concert: "They are going to execute Beethoven's 8th symphony and the overture to Dorn's *Nibelungen*. Zellner has published two charming articles on this amphibian—without charm for Dorn, be it said—boldly taking the part of Wagner, whose name he categorically forbids to be soiled with a comparison." Liszt's answer to the enfant terrible's insouciant rebuke is not on record.

Dramatis personæ: Brunhild, Queen of Isenland [a freak spelling for Iceland], mezzo soprano; Tyro, coastguard on Isenland, bass; Queen's herald, tenor; Günther, king of the Burgundians, tenor; Chriemhild, his sister, soprano; Hagen von Tronegge, bass; Marshal Dankwart, barytone; Volker von Alzei, tenor; Siegfried, crown-heir of the Netherlands, barytone; Etzel (Attila), king of the Huns, bass; a Hun warrior, tenor. Isenland warriors, serving-women and shield-maidens [Amazons, more probably from Vischer's "warlike virgin with shining armour," than from Wagner's Valkyries]; Burgundian ladies, princes, knights, pages and sailors. Hun warriors, maids and women. The first act plays on Isenland; the second and third (two years later) at and near Worms; the fourth and fifth (ten years later) at Etzel's court in Hungary.

Act I. Tyro sings a watching song, and observes a ship approaching. In it appear to be Günther, Volker, Dankwart, Siegfried and Hagen, the first three of whom operatically announce all their three names together, in answer to Tyro's "Who comes?" whilst Siegfried and Hagen wish Günther "victory and fame." Sailors' chorus. Herald brings the Queen of Isenland's greetings. Günther says he has come to court her, and knows that he must "vanquish her thrice, in spear-throwing, archery and wrestling. If she conquers me, my doom is death." Siegfried offers to win Brunhild for him, if Günther will give him his sister Chriemhild, with whom his words suggest that he was previously acquainted. Siegfried sings a romance, "In youth's first days I slew a dragon; with magic power its blood protects me." Günther promises Chriemhild to Siegfried; with Hagen they sing a terzet; Volker and Dankwart joining in, there ensues a quintet about Siegfried's bravery.—Chorus of women, and dance [apparently the "shield-maidens," as the to-becited *N.Z.* speaks of "some Icelandic dances of striking characteristique"]. Praise of Brunhild; herald comes in, and says she is defeated. Brunhild enters, and naturally wishes herself dead. Günther re-enters, and tries to be immediately affectionate; his want of tact annoys her, but he sings a cavatina telling her to come home with him to the Rhine, which fetches her completely; she sings an arioso, and they join in a duettino about *Lieb' und Treue.* His friends come in, and he foolishly introduces Siegfried to the lady; all congratulate themselves out loud, Hagen saying, "A charm won conquest, to whose secret none is pledged; end how it may, the hand of loyalty shall shield the king."

Act II. Chorus about "German women strewing flowers on the path of Chriemhild, who has wed the hero" [Siegfried]. Brunhild, "We have missed you long; I had almost given up the pleasure of seeing you." Chriemhild, "Excuse me! my dear little son would not be torn from me." Chorus goes on again. Chriemhild thanks them, and promises to reward them with part of the Nibelung treasure. Brunhild is cross at this, thinking Chriemhild too proud; so she hints at C.'s being "a servant's wife." Volker comes in, and sings a song to the ladies in praise of "home," just as if he had heard *Tannhäuser* lately. The chorus encourages him; so does Brunhild at first, but then snubs him and praises soldiers. Chriemhild wants to reward him; the women quarrel about precedence, and Brunhild more pointedly calls her sister-in-law a "serving-man's wife," adding that she herself wore a crown

before marriage. Chriemhild can't stand this, and a tournament having been proposed by the shouting chorus, she says, "To the best man? Brunhild, I'm not so clear on that. If 'twas Günther's arm alone that bent you, how came the serving-man to snatch from you a ring? Look, princess, do you recognise it?" Brunhild, "What to me is a ring on your hand? When Günther vanquished me in fight, I flung the silly trinket into the maw of our family idol. Who dares to boast of favours gained from me?" Chriem. "Look at its graving, then! Must the serving-man's wife still make way for you?" Brun. "Ha!" on a top note, followed by a duet in which the jewellery is forgotten. The chorus seems to recommend the slaying of Siegfried, till Dankwart comes in and tells them to congratulate a hero; Brunhild asks if it is Günther her husband, and upon hearing that it is Siegfried she says she will crown him of course. Chorus purrs: Günther enters and praises S. to B., who repeats that she'll crown him. Siegfried offers a renewed oath of lealty, to which Brunhild replies with "Traitor!" A confused row ensues, Chriemhild crying "Woe's me!" and Brunhild making a fuss about the ring. Günther demands an explanation; Siegfried says that he got the ring on a journey and gave it to Chriemhild. C. says she has noticed the name of Brunhild carved in runes on the ring; chorus screams about the king's honour. S. says he had never observed the name on the ring; Günther immediately proposes a hunting-party, and invites Siegfried. The ladies are not in the least satisfied: chorus. Brunhild is savage and urges G. to "hot vengeance" on S.; Hagen ditto—trio from *Gtdg* ii, in fact, to wind up this act.

Act III. Duet between Chriemhild and Siegfried: she says she didn't mean to hurt his feelings; he is amiable to her; she advises him not to go to the hunt in the Odenwald; he says he must, as he has promised—she has dreamt he will die there. They part affectionately, with repeated "kiss me"s. She sings an arioso about him.—Next scene (evidently), an introduction and cavatina for Siegfried, who has arrived at the spring where the hunting-party had appointed to rest; he sings about a *Brust*, presumably his wife's. Hagen entering, S. says that he wants to go home, as he has killed no more than he did in *Gtdg*. They are thirsty, however, and Hagen, having no wine, gets Siegfried to drink after him at the spring, then stabs him through the back. Siegfried declares his innocence, and dies praying for his wife and child. Chorus comes on, and asks what the matter is; Hagen replies that he killed Siegfried for the king's honour. Chriemhild says she cannot live without Siegfried, which Brunhild unkindly answers with "Then die with him!" (What took the ladies to the picnic, does not appear.) Chriemhild appeals to her royal brother for redress on behalf of herself and her child; Günther and chorus tell her it's her own fault; then she cringes before Brunhild (a little like Ortrud's hypocritical appeal to Elsa), but B. and the chorus are very abusive. C. makes a wild appeal for a champion to come and help her (evidently she knows *Lohengrin* well); Hagen says he did right to kill Siegfried; Chriemhild is further annoyed. Dankwart enters, and says Attila will soon arrive. C. remarks that, as Heaven has deserted her, Hell sends her help.

Act IV. Women's chorus, not very contented with present state of affairs.

It seems to have taken Attila ten years to kill off impediments to a marriage with Chriemhild; she wants him to avenge her still more; he seems to appreciate her bloodthirstiness. War-like chorus of Huns. Günther, Dankwart and Hagen arrive; C. appears to have made it a condition of consent to marry A., that her relatives shall first be got to call. Günther remarks that they have come to the wedding, come in peace; all, "A German's troth, a German's word, that is the Nibelungen's hoard!" Etzel (Attila) feels awkward about this visit, as he knows his wife will want him to kill the visitors. Chriemhild is civil, and inquires why Brunhild has not come too. B. appears; the ladies quarrel, as usual; G. laments the wearisome row. Attila declares that it would be all right if G. would give Chriemhild the treasure stolen from her; G.'s retinue, "Don't you wish you may get it!" Hagen offers to give himself up in place of the hoard—presumably to be executed for S.'s murder; they all talk a great deal, and at last H. says he threw the hoard into the Rhine, lest a woman's hand should bring a curse on the land through it. Chriemhild is annoyed; B., G., V., H. and the Burgundians all begin to pray, in their terror; all scream about revenge, and swear to stick together.

Act V. Chorus of Burgundians, very pleased with the idea of being killed. Huns in chorus call on their king for revenge; Chriemhild sings a revenge aria of her own: Günther and Brunhild are brought before her, singing a duettino about "love and fidelity till death"; C. can't put up with such spooning from an old married couple in public, and shouts "Why do I still delay? Let them have their wish!" They continue their duet, till C. cries (and no wonder!) "Away with them!" Etzel enters, apparently having just killed them; then C. asks Hagen where *is* the hoard. H. answers that he is under oath not to tell, and won't, even when it appears that his king is dead; so Chriemhild kills him. After that, Etzel wants their marriage celebrated, but C. meanly cries off, saying she will be true to Siegfried's memory; so she, also, appears to die, as the female chorus sings of Love and Curse, Death and Night, while the males cry Victory and the "end of the race of Nibelungen."

No changes of scene nor stage-directions are marked, so that it was no easy matter to decipher the meaning; there *may* be no meaning at all. Chriemhild has a little the longer part [in the score, no doubt; but it must have been lopped to make Johanna-Brunhild leading lady].

A pretty play for the manes of Goethe and Schiller to stand godfather to! Enough to kill the whole subject for another generation. Nor should I be surprised if one of Wagner's reasons for stopping composition of his RING half-way, had been disgust at the bare idea of being measured with this nondescript. How could he hope to get a special theatre built for *his* "Nibelungen," or even a publisher for its score, with this ghastly inanity staring folk in the face? Best wait till all recollection of it be decently buried.

For the thing hung on awhile at Berlin through Johanna's priceless efforts, and so late as March 58 we have Bülow writing A. Ritter: "In spite of my incessant pleading that she should bring off a few Tannhäuser performances, your sister-in-law has taken no steps to

that end, but sings Nibelungen, Macbeth [Taubert, première Nov. 11, 57], Tancred—it's abominable!" With her retirement in 1859 it appears to have died a natural death, as the only other theatre I can hear of as having given it a trial was that of Königsberg, its composer's birthplace, thus chronicled in the *N.Z.* of June 2, 55: "On the 14th May H. Dorn's Nibelungen arrived at a first performance at Königsberg, with applause. Our collaborator there, L. Köhler [whom Liszt had interested in the work, as we saw], reports that the book is written not without skill, yet with no poetic beauty; several moments are full of grandeur and excitement [which?], and then the music soars aloft, but in general it remains on a 'half-overcome standpoint' in a certain mongrelry between old and new. The instrumentation is praised, as also the solid spirit and the characteristique: poesy of musical idea and inspiration are met only here and there, but missed in general. . . . The beneficiary, Frl. Carl, did excellently as Chrimhilde [odd, to find the lead given back to C.] . . . We should like to see this opera performed on many a stage, in lieu of various unworthy Verdi-scandal-operas." So Brendel himself hasn't the courage to rebuke a larceny; posterity, however, has preferred even those same "scandal-operas."

Bülow, as usual, is less undecided. To Robert Radecke he writes Feb. 55, "Truhn and I are busy studying the vocal score of Heinrich Egmont* Dorn's Die Nibelungen, and perhaps shall take occasion soon to * * * thoroughly this lovely botch." A "perhaps" that doesn't seem to have gone farther. Diplomatic intervention? It would never have done, you see, to let an opera publicly dedicated to the Weimar Grand Duke be damned in public by a young-Weimarianer. Nevertheless, I would rather take Hans' opinion on any musico-dramatic subject than that of the whole staff of the *Neue Zeitschrift* and its regular contributors, high or low.

Page 397. To Bülow on Harmony.—Written in midst of the composition of *Die Walküre* to a young man who in most things was pre-eminently *his* pupil, the following letter of Wagner's forms an instructive pendant to that addressed during the scoring of *Rheingold* to an other-minded teacher (226 *ant.*):—

"Best Hans!—Many thanks for your letter, and still more for your packet! Your compositions have much engrossed and stimulated me; yet from the outset of my acquaintance with them I felt rather awkward about your expecting a verdict which I cannot pretend to deliver. How, in the first place, am I to come by a distinct presentment of the case? You know my infamous piano-playing, which permits me to master nothing save what I already have a plain notion

* The "Egmont" is probably a joke, as Dorn's baptismal names were Heinrich Ludwig Edmund.

of: whereas what I take-in with the eye is too little, against what I ask of a thing, to give me an idea of it. And then, you admit that your style in every respect is of such a kind that it cannot be judged without a convincing experience of the impression when rendered. So I longed for two things: first, you as piano-player; second, a perfect paragon of an orchestra—to learn exactly how your music sounds. What I've cobbled for myself without such aids, the imperfect image I alone have been able to piece together, I cannot, will not deem the thing itself; and consequently warn you that—you still remain my debtor.—If, then, I'm to judge your compositions by what I fancy I've understood in my naïve fashion, you'll have to content yourself with the following merely personal opinion.

"Your inventiveness struck me at once: your gift for that is undeniably strong, and especially manifest in the later work, the orchestral fantasia. The thematic structure is large and perspicuous of plan and development, and particularly new in the fantasia, because derived entirely from the object. The characterisation of motives is clear, though not yet so defined in the Cæsar-overture as in the fantasia; at least, after the impression I've spelt out for myself, I cannot quite refer each motive positively to a definite object; though that lies perhaps in the subject-matter, which certainly is not too favourable. This also—so it seems to me—has had its influence here [the *Cæsar*, a revision, *cf* iii, 291*n*] in making the themes less original, i.e. less *speaking:* thus the principal theme in the brass e.g. I can't think quite distinctive, but rather like the bombast one invariably turns out when one's not quite sure what to do with a given poetic motive. That has already changed most advantageously in the fantasia: here you were more certain of your affair, and if ever a piece of music had mood (*Stimmung*) it is this; that it's a frightful mood, is another matter. In this composition, taken all round, you are much more individual; here everything is unmistakably your own. In both works, moreover, I admire your technique; in which I consider you will not be easily surpassed as regards difficult forms, either in detail or the whole cut. Accordingly I'm bound to accord you mastership, as I am of opinion that you're equal to doing whatever you will. On the other hand, if I have a serious scruple regarding the formal side, it touches your attitude towards harmonic euphony: in this respect—I confess—I have as yet received no other impression than that of a highly significant music executed on instruments out of tune; and it is for that reason that I still must wish for a conclusive sense-impression, from an excellent performance, ere I can be rid of my uneasiness. I know from experience, of course, that there are objects even of musical portraiture which cannot possibly be expressed without one's finding for them harmonies, as well, that are bound to offend the ear of the musical philistine. Recognising this when at work myself,

however, a very definite instinct has always led me to cover up the harmonic harshness as much as possible, and so to dispose that in the end it should cease to be felt at all as such (to *my* mind). Now, I can't yet rid myself of the sensation that you've taken almost the opposite bent, as if you positively sought to get the harshness felt as harshness; and that strikes me worst where I see this harshness virtually constitute the whole invention. You may think me a philistine, or not, but I confess that at no price should I have cared, e.g. to write the

at close of the fantasia—were it only because this surprise is too cheap. Neither can I conceive what is gained, for instance, by the natural D in

except that one shall think it played false. To the



I have tried hard to accustom myself, as I saw that you set much store by it: at times I've succeeded, notably by stamping the idea of suicidal mania on my mind [*vid. inf.*]. But I can't get it to stay, and I fall back on my old weakness, of believing that art consists in so imparting the strangest, most unusual emotions to the hearer, that his attention shall not be distracted by the material side of hearing, but wheedled, as it were, into yielding itself without resistance even to the most alien of feelings.

"See, Hans, I've passed through this sort of mill myself, and in my earliest composing period [*cf P.* I. 371], when I thought nothing of account till I had found it another such harmonic conceit. Then, however, I had arrived at no good workmanship, and should decidedly have been in no position to write a piece of music that had such hands and feet, and shewed such mastery, as your fantasia. With yourself, accordingly, it makes me wonder: surely, you are mistaking yourself; you've much too much inventiveness, seriously to please yourself in such chenille. Look you, there's something so cold and Jewish-indifferent about it, when others—as indeed they do—pay heed to

nothing in our message but the like peculiarities, and make fun of us about them as if the root of the matter were naught.—

"You see, what trifles I account these, and how convinced I am that my objection to your works hits nothing save their inessentials, not their essence. So accept my verdict—though I utterly decline to let it rank as such—as nothing but very favourable. In spite of defective acquaintance, I can't recall a modern piece of music that has struck so home to my sympathy, as your fantasia in particular. Have you heard it yourself?—You don't say.

"That was really the chief topic for to-day. Of other things I'll write another time.—My life has gone to the dogs [&c.; for the Schopenhauer bit see 397].

"By the way, I shall be delighted if my worm-melody [*Rheingold*] helps you to digest your food. Lohengrin comes out at Breslau in a few days' time.

"Farewell, and stay fond of me! Your R. W."

One thing to be remarked in the above, is the dead silence as to *Die Walküre's* progress, even though the "worm-melody" might have brought it to the tip of the tongue: remembering the concurrent Weimar "thunderbolt" and antecedent jealousy at Hans' first sight of *Rheingold*, we may take this silence as another precaution against offence. The remainder of the letter will speak for itself: a graphic illustration of the advice Wagner claims, a quarter of a century hence, to have *always* given young composers (180-1 *ant.*). And here we have unique occasion for comparison with the counsel, if such it may be termed, of the chieftain whom Hans had but recently left. For Liszt also writes him, four weeks before Wagner (Sept. 30, 54): "I have just run through your orchestral fantasia ('*Ein Leben im Tode*'*). It is noble, profound, firm-knit—at times even a trifle knotty (what they call '*knotig*' in German, I fancy), and in sum this work does you great honour, though you have no *immediate profit* to expect from it. The poetic conception, and the mental plane on which your ideas move, are too distant from the habits of a theatrical or concert audience, for you to be able to count on what one calls success. You will probably enjoy the esteem and sympathy of a few good judges: Wagner, Berlioz, Joachim and some others, will applaud and clasp you by the hand—but the mass of Maîtres de Chapelle, Musik-Directoren and bandsmen, will kick and cry barbarity, just as with Joachim's two overtures, 'Hamlet' and 'Demetrius,' which bear a

* "A life in death." La Mara, editress of the one-vol. correspondence of Liszt and Bülow (French, with a few of B.'s letters German), adds a note: "Originally conceived as overture to an unpublished tragedy of that name by Carl Ritter, it subsequently appeared under the title 'Nirwana'" (considerably later, and then revised as op. 20).

certain family-likeness to your Fantaisie. For my part, I avow that of all the symphonic works I have looked through in too great number these last few years, it is to Joachim's overtures and your 'César' and Fantaisie that I give my preference, as they bear the supreme stamp of fine works of art: nobleness of sentiment and a pronounced individuality of style. Ritter has only sent me the score: I suppose Pohl will bring me the band-parts you promise me; if you have forgotten to have them copied out, don't trouble; I will get them done here, and we will execute you on the first occasion," etc. Very encouraging (tho' that occasion never came off), also agreeing on the main point with Wagner's humbler non-verdict; but one misses that salutary criticism of detail which is the most valuable factor in any real master's opinion on a young aspirant's work. Now see the consequences.

Hans is elated of course, in that letter announcing to Liszt the despatch of the *Rheingold* score; but after digesting Wagner's criticism, he writes Liszt again (Nov. 20): "How happy I should be to learn that, after a rehearsal, you think the Fantaisie capable of producing some sort of a result when addressed to the *ear*. Would it interest you to glance at the lines Wagner sent me on the subject of this score? In spite of much indulgence and kindness, his *dernier mot* is not so favourable as yours. The principal reproach he makes me—touching harmonic cacophony—has nevertheless elicited from me a humble protest against his accusation of having departed from the seriousness of art with a frivolous indifference that plays at eccentricity and horsewhips the 'Pelistim' (*Ohrfeigen für feige Ohren*).* I believe, however, he is quite right in censuring the penultimate chord of the seventh (or rather, '*the false triad*': f sharp—a—c; d sharp *is an anticipation*) the crescendo whereof leads up to the final harmony on the tonic. Would you, also, advise me to change this harmony into that I employ at the commencement of the introduction?"

In the long run Bülow chose the better part, omitting the passage altogether (according to La Mara), but Liszt's answer of Nov. 27 avoids the special question: "As to the '*Ohrfeigen für feige Ohren*,' I will write you about them when we have rehearsed the piece that contains, if I be not mistaken, a considerable enough number of them. While reading, I was not particularly shocked by them, and the only thing that would seize me with a little cowardice is the pitilessly sombre and morose character of this work. It would almost need a *parterre de suicidés* to applaud it, and I have a little fear lest its success should much resemble that of my *Künstler-Chor* at Carlsruhe.

* *Pelistim* is Hebrew for "Philistine"; the *Ohrfeigen*, *etc.*—"a box on the ears for wooden ears"—must also be a Weimar catchword. Needless to say, Hans rather colours up the blame, in his endeavour to condense it.

Joachim has just sent me two new scores. . . . Send me Wagner's letter on your symphony" (i.e. fantasia). As Hans was on a tournée when this request of Liszt's reached him, therefore unable to comply with it promptly, we hear no more of the conflict of judgments; yet we have heard enough to shew *which* was the wiser. Liszt could scarcely be expected to tax the youngster with the very faults his own example, for instance in that selfsame *Künstler-Chor*, itself had encouraged (*cf* 226 *ant.*).

Now we may guess, perhaps, why so very few of these young-Weimar people brought forth creative works that have lived. Liszt's methods and counsels, though generally confounded with, were widely at variance with his greater friend's. Toward the end of his life, Wagner wrote as follows: "Were our 'Professors' who still cry Fie on me, to set me on one of their sacred chairs, they perhaps might be seized with still greater surprise at the caution and moderation, especially in the use of harmonic effects, which I should recommend to their pupils; as I should have to make it their foremost rule, never to quit a key so long as what they have to say, can still be said in it. Were this rule followed, perhaps we might get symphonies etc. to hear again that gave us something to talk about, instead of there being just nothing at all to be said of our latest symphonies" (*P.* VI. 190-1). And that is in perfect accord not only with the above letter of Oct. 54 to Bülow, but also with Brahms' dispassionate remark on "the *misunderstood* Wagner" (217 *ant.*). No one could have been more opposed than the "Artist of the Future" to the "Musicians of the Future" and their go-as-you-please. Remember Sachs' lesson to Walther.

Page 406. A LISZTIANER'S MARE'S NEST; WITH A WORD ON "LEITMOTIVE."—One of the funniest things I have read for a long time, is the list gravely drawn up by Herr Göllerich of themes the Lisztianers accuse Wagner of stealing from their chieftain; a list with a portentous preamble:—

"Not till Liszt's appearance as creative Tone-poet could a 'new-German' *school* be spoken of. Richard Wagner was the first, path-breaking, to set up the new principles for Dramatic music. But *on every other field* of musical activity it was the Progress-daring mind of Franz Liszt that *first* ruled new-creatively, opening new teachings for the Future equally on every hand. In him, too, were innate the imperative reforms that slumbered in the post-Beethovenian period; instinctively he raised them on the banner of his very earliest musical efforts.

"At the same age that Richard Wagner (1831) was dedicating to his teacher Weinlig his first pfte-sonata (B flat, op. 1)—which moves entirely in the ban of the old-classical masters Haydn and Mozart,

and the culmination of whose musical expression in nowise transcends the *first-period Beethoven*—we see Liszt occupied with sketches for a grand 'revolutionary (!) symphony' (1829 to 1830).* The principal theme of its Adagio has been preserved to us. It forms—'unaltered,' according to Liszt's own testimony—the melodic root-idea of the later Symphonic poem 'Helden-Klage.' Now compare the expressional-form of the two striplings Liszt and Wagner, in these musical imagings of their eighteenth year, and you will not have much difficulty in deciding *which* of the two *first* went new ways. Passing on to the *Rienzi*-period [conveniently ignoring *Die Feen*, *Das Liebesverbot*, etc., etc.], we see Liszt winning quite unprecedentedly novel musical forms in his compositions of that date [examples, please!]. At the time of both masters' highest attainment of creative power we find in many a great work of Franz Liszt's the positive precursors of Wagner's *Deeds in music*, so that in not infrequent cases certain Wagnerian themes appear forethought in melodic figures of Liszt's (often wellnigh note for note).

"Merely to name a few, we recommend circumstantial comparison (as regards thematic figures [*thematische Bildungen*], musical structure and general colouring) between: 'Orpheus' and 'Tristan und Isolde,' 'Faust-symphony' and 'Tristan und Isolde,' 'Faust-symphony' and 'Die Walküre,' '*Benediction de Dieu dans la solitude*' and 'Isolde's Liebestod,' 'Die Ideale' and 'Der Ring des Nibelungen' (especially 'Rheingold'), 'Invocation' and 'Parsifal,' 'Hunnen-Schlacht' and 'Walküren-Ritt,' 'Hunnen-Schlacht' and 'Kundry-Ritt,' 'Die Legende von der heiligen Elisabeth' and 'Parsifal,' 'Christus' and 'Parsifal,' 'Excelsior' and 'Parsifal' etc ["circumstantial comparison" of an "etc." is distinctly precious]. In 'Walküre' the first theme of the 'Faust-symphony,' in 'Tristan und Isolde' (as so-called 'Blickmotiv'—) one of the most characteristic themes of Liszt's 'Faust' is to be re-encountered *completely note for note.* The Gretchenmotiv in the later edition of Wagner's 'Eine Faust-Ouverture' also proceeds from Liszt, and the beginning of 'Parsifal' entirely chimes with the earlier-written beginning of 'Excelsior.' If with these examples merely chosen at random (*Beispielen nur geringer Auswahl*) we endeavour to invalidate the myths in circulation, that Liszt had been obliged to borrow

* "To a not much later period (1833) fall Liszt's sketches for the mighty Berg-Symphonie (after Hugo's poem: '*Ce qu'on entend sur la montagne*')"—Göllerich's note to the above; tacitly contradicted by his Nuremberg colleague L. Ramann, who informs us that "The first of the Symphonic poems . . . otherwise termed Berg-Symphonie, was sketched in the winter 1847-8 at Woronince, worked out and instrumented 1849" at Weimar. In G.'s previous paragraph I beg you to note the nice distinction between Wagner, who merely "bahnbrechend aufstellte," and Liszt who "neuschöpferisch waltete"; it is on a par with Nohl's, "Liszt's Symphonic poems develop farther the seed which Beethoven's Symphony had sown."

themes from Wagner, we hope we have thereby exposed ourselves to no misinterpretation [Here follows Göllerich's own *Faust-Walküre* myth—*vid.* 406 *ant.*] . . .

"Just as wholly independently and with instinctive gift of origination, was Liszt the *first* to apply the new fundamental laws which he recognised as necessary for Progress, to the forms of the Symphony, the Chorus, the Lied, the Etude, the Pfte-concerto and the whole pfte-style in general, the Organ composition and Church music in all its branches—thus with full consciousness to bring these laws to currency for all future time in all those departments which Wagner had not touched *at all* [?!]. Moreover, even in his writings as a youth of twenty ["*zwanzigjähriger*"—say rather, turned twenty-three and onward], especially that 'On the Situation of Artists,' Liszt defined these his quite new views and demands in a fully analogous manner to that adopted later by Rich. Wagner out of utmost need of being misunderstood in his art-writings ["*aus höchster Noth des Unverstandenseins in seinen Kunstschriften gethan*"—fidelity to the text forbids my making sense]. A comparison of Liszt's much earlier treatises on Art and Artists with Wagner's writings is in many respects most instructive! . . .

"Here should be specially instanced the essay 'Berlioz and his Harold-Symphony' (1855) . . . In this study are given, among other things, the weightiest elucidations of Liszt's own procedure (*Schaffen*), in closer development of the following thoughts, 'The general attitude toward works of Progress . . . Man as supreme product of creative Nature, Art as supreme product of creative Man' (Compare the analogous axioms of Wagner's 'Kunstwerk der Zukunft'!—)" and so on (Göllerich's *Liszt* booklet, pp. 9-14).

Before demolishing these impudent assertions and insinuations, I must observe that, though the author himself is obscure enough in a twofold sense to be beneath our notice, his publisher is not. Reclam's *Universalbibliothek*, with its thousands of cheap little volumes, is one of the powers to be reckoned with in German literature to-day: their copyright once expired, standard works of the very highest class are reprinted by "Reclam," and in a wholly worthy manner, considering the infinitesimal price; for 2½d one can purchase Goethe's *Goetz*, e.g., for 1s. five-hundred pages of Schopenhauer. Consequently, a "Liszt" biography issued in such a series is certain to find its way into thousands of homes, be perused by millions of readers: its power for the dissemination of truth or not-truth is quite incalculable; even on the other side of the Atlantic has this amazing screed been quoted in good faith. It is time, then, to shew Herr Göllerich *et al.* that his hope has not stayed unfulfilled, the hope that "we have exposed ourselves to no misinterpretation." A long-standing *opposition sourde* of Weimar-Rome to Bayreuth here finds a double voice at Nuremberg, but a voice of no double meaning; he who runs, may read.

Take the last of Göllerich's "comparisons" first, and it will lay the whole method bare. Headings from a "table of contents" by Frl. Ramann (so acknowledged in a footnote) are made the foundation of a perfidious innuendo that Wagner's *Art-work of the Future* derived its chief ideas from "Liszt's" essay on Berlioz' *Harold:* unfortunately, the said treatise of Wagner's was presented in print to Liszt, who "could not understand" it (cf. letter 56), nearly *five years before* Carolyszt wrote that Berlioz-*Harold* essay. Of a verity, a parallel "in many respects most instructive!"—so instructive, that I need waste no time on Liszt's frothy feuilletons before the Weimar period, even supposing them wholly *his*, but merely state a fact ignored by the Nuremberg coterie, namely that Wagner's remarkable little essay "On German Opera" was written and published in 1834, a year before that *Situation* aforesaid, and therefore at a younger age. It really doesn't matter, though, since at no time did Liszt make a contribution of real moment to æsthetic or technical literature: even the long disquisition on the province most associated with him, that of Programme-music, is little more than a rewarming of remarks and researches made by two or three anticipators, whilst there is good reason to assign the chief part of it to Pss C. W.'s pen.

Passing to the musical side, no critic in his senses would dream of comparing any pieces published by Liszt before his settling down at Weimar with those 'three romantic' works of Wagner's which hold the operatic boards with growing vigour year by year. Their predecessor *Rienzi*, alive to-day, and likely to be more alive to-morrow, alone would dwarf the whole of Liszt's creative efforts to that date (and how much later?), unless we judge by a numeric catalogue; whereas it is diverting to hear one of the Nuremberg pair boasting of a theme "preserved to us unaltered" from an early age, while the other informs us that it is Hungarian of origin and the sketches for the said "revolutionary symphony" have all been lost! Imagine yourself assured that Aptommas once conceived the plan of a War-symphony to be founded on the *Men of Harlech*, which, *had* it been realised, would have thrown all Balfe's operas into the shade. Let these comparers produce something tangible with a quarter the mastery of form displayed by that despised early sonata of Wagner's, or his unmentioned symphony of but a few months later, and we may begin to try conclusions with them anent a whole portfolio of unpublished overtures, and so on, that preceded *Die Feen*, itself completed ere the end of 1833. Their case breaks down at every point on the far side of the mid-century, without our requiring to ask precisely *what* new form or new idea Liszt added to music, that Berlioz, Chopin, Franz, or Schumann, had not filled full beforehand, or what aching void would appear in musical history, outside pfte technique and the Church, had Liszt never written a bar. Even the

"Symphonic poem," what "new" element does it import, beyond a rather doubtful name? Not to go back to Beethoven's *Coriolanus* and *Egmont*, to Mendelssohn's *Hebrides* and so on, had Wagner not written his *Tannhäuser*, *Holländer* and *Faust*, overtures—each of them orchestral poems in the fullest sense—before Liszt so much as began combining strings with wind? To tell the honest truth, it was from close acquaintance with Berlioz' and Wagner's scores, and a laudable spirit of emulation, that Liszt commenced his instrumental flight. To those with more experience of the subject than can be gleaned in English concert-rooms I leave it, to decide whether the net result evinces calculating talent or unbridled genius: comparisons with WAGNER'S works, in any case, must prove disastrous.

And now for Liszt's last secretary's specific charges, his "mere random" dribblings from a lucky-bag which should really be disgorged in full, to promote the gaiety of nations:—

Orpheus and *Tristan*.—Certainly, Wagner heard Liszt conduct *Orpheus* a year before even the poem of *Tr. u. Is.* was committed to paper; but in not one of the characteristic examples of the *Orpheus* music supplied by L. Ramann (*Franz Liszt*) is there a ghost of resemblance to any part of *Tristan*. State a definite case, and we may entertain the analogy; not before.

Faust-symphony and *Tristan*.—An equally vague comparison: stultified on the one hand by the fact that Wagner had seen and heard nothing of that symphony till the whole of *Tristan* lay in the Härtels' hands; on the other, by the putative resemblances being traceable either to his own or to other composers' still earlier works. Unfortunately for his argument, G. does condescend to one detail here: he instances the "Blickmotiv" as reproducing "note for note a characteristic theme of Liszt's 'Faust.'" So much the worse for Liszt's *Faust*, as the *Bayr. Bl.* 1899 (p. 67) convincingly shews this theme not only in Wagner's Faust-overture (where it may or may not be due to the revision, '55), but also in *Rienzi*, *Tannh.* and *Loh.* Not content with that, G. has the effrontery to assert point-blank that "the Gretchenmotiv in the later edition of Wagner's Faust-overture also proceeds from Liszt." There is *no* Gretchen-motive in the Faust-overture of Wagner, who pointedly declined to introduce one (*W.-L.*, letters 88 and 176 [Eng.—173 German]); whereas if Liszt's ex-secretary had *studied* his master's correspondence, he would have found him actually quoting in letter 86 (1852) the subject of "the middle section," i.e. the miscalled Gretchen-theme of 1840, a quotation in full agreement, so far as it goes, with the form of '55 onward. *That* is an absolutely disgraceful blunder, rendering it almost superfluous to add that in neither of the two examples of the *Bénédiction* given by L. R. could you detect "Isolde's Liebestod" even by standing the sheets on their heads.

With the *Faust-symphony* and *Walküre* analogy I have already dealt (406 *ant.*); but the "Walküren-Ritt" is also supposed by G. to have been annexed from Liszt's "Hunnen-Schlacht." Impertinence has wellnigh gone its full length here. On unimpeachable data Liszt's first conception of his *H.-S.* is assigned by L. R. to December 1856, its completion to Feb. 10, 1857: just previously he had spent six weeks or so at Zurich, when *Die Walküre* was constantly *en évidence;* whilst its entire full score was in his keeping at this very time. It would have been better *not* to draw attention to this particular resemblance. As for the "Kundry-Ritt," on the other hand, written twenty years later, one would have to prove that Wagner had ever heard Liszt's *Hunnen-Schlacht*, and heard it within a reasonable period, to make any capital of a meagre likeness to its introductory theme.

Die Ideale and *Der Ring des Nib.*, "especially *Rheingold*."—Here impertinence reaches the last inch of its tether. "Liszt projected the 'Ideale' in summer 1856, but did not compose it till about Whitsuntide of the following year, at Aachen," L. R. informs us. The lent score of "especially *Rheingold*" he had detained for nearly five months in 1854-5, much to Wagner's inconvenience; of both the *Rheingold* and *Walküre* full scores he was taking care, in order to secure a publisher, for about the whole period covered by L. R.'s sentence. Once more, a discreet veil had best be dropped over any real resemblances, by Wagner's arraigners.

There remains *Parsifal*.—If there be any likeness here to Liszt's little pfte *Invocation* (pubd 1853), it is that of a common source, the so-called "Dresden Amen," which Tappert has lately shewn (*Mus. Woch.*, July 30, 1903) to have been appropriated not only by Mendelssohn (Reformation-sym.), but also by Karl Loewe (*Gang nach dem Eisenhammer*), Spohr (pfte viol. duo, op. 96), and therefore maybe by others. As for *S. Elisabeth* and *Christus*, I refuse to be drawn into what the lawyers term a fishing inquiry without definite particulars: all three works resting on a religious basis, it is not at all improbable that Wagner and Liszt may have met in a common quarry—Palestrina; but again we must have chapter and verse, not these sweeping wild statements. The *Excelsior* case is of another order, and historic interest; since this charge, like that *Faust-Walküre* one, seems to have been started by Liszt himself, and three of his friends renew it.

On page 354 of the last volume of her *Franz Liszt* (1894), speaking of his organ-compositions, Frl. Ramann includes "—1875 (?) Prelude to the 'Bells of Strassburg,' the chief-motive of which [Footnote by L. R. —"Still MS.; in the hands of the firm Schuberth & Co."—i.e. this *Excelsior* "prelude," as the cantata itself was published by S. & Co. 1875] *R. Wagner*, as known, embodied with his 'Parsifal'." Frl. R. kindly gives us that "chief-motive," and still more kindly follows it with the first quarter of

Wagner's Liebesmahl-theme in two examples from *Parsifal*, the first of which latter I omit as superfluous :

Liszt's "Excelsior."



Wagner: *Parsifal.*



Well, if one had nothing more to go by, than a date its own chronicler queries, one would have said that this *Excelsior* theme was the product of an improviser trying to remember the Liebesmahl theme, but lamentably breaking down on its third and fourth notes. On a keyed instrument the four essential notes and their order are the same as in *Parsifal*, but their rhythm is fatally altered by one imperfection, and in this guise the grouplet is scarcely apprehensible as a plastic entity ; 'tis a stem without a flower. Significantly enough, this stem is not employed by Wagner as a self-contained 'motive,' though the second and third quarters of the Liebesmahl-theme respectively *are ;* nevertheless, he gives it a certain subtle repose by his slight lingering on the *third* note, which thus completes a harmonic triad ; whereas Liszt's rhythm and phrasing break it in two. A "most instructive" illustration of the diverse use to be made of the same raw material in different hands.

But the strangest part is the historic aspect, in its various versions. An article in the *Bayr. Bl.* 1900 already cited (247*n ant.*) quotes the following anecdote by "one of Liszt's most distinguished pupils" (ergo, excluding A. G.): "Coming from Rome, in September 1880 Liszt paid a visit to the master at Sienna. . . . He returned full of life and spirits, younger by 20 years . . . At Sienna he had had a glimpse of Parsifal, which, as he joyfully narrated, was finished now (*nun fertig sei*) and merely needed a couple of months' instrumenting. The master had jokingly told him, 'I've stolen from you,' and as I [presumably the pupil] was puzzling in vain for the meaning of the master's joke, he added at once himself [presum. Liszt], singing the motive in question, '*Die Glocken von Strassburg* begin like that—well, a time will come for them too.' Yet, from the way in which those words were uttered, half aside (*nebenbei hingeworfen*), it sounded as if he were proud of that joke of the master's. At Sienna arose Liszt's 'Angelus' for string-quartet."—Since the writer of the *B. Bl.* article does not vouch for any details of this story, merely citing it as an instance of L.'s attitude toward W.'s "humour," I may be permitted to question its accuracy. The dates themselves throw doubt on that. L. Ramann informs us more than once that the *Angelus* quartet was written at Rome in 1882, whereas Liszt's visit to Sienna could only have taken place, as stated above, in autumn 1880 ; moreover, the composition of

Parsifal was already finished April '79 (letter to E. Heckel) and its completion must therefore have been stale news to Liszt Sept. 1880, whilst its scoring lasted no mere "couple of months" after the Sienna meeting, but one year and a quarter. From a diary, or other record written at the time, the anecdote accordingly can not have come. It is further shaken by the fact that a time had *already* "come" for Liszt's *Glocken*, namely at a concert given by himself and Wagner at Pesth March 10, 1875, in aid of the Bayreuth theatre. There Wagner of course heard *Die Glocken*—barytone solo, mixed chorus, grand orchestra—but equally of course not the *Excelsior* "prelude," even if written by then, as the printed programme says no word about an organ. How, then, could Wagner have volunteered a confession of theft from a work the MS. whereof Liszt is nowhere alleged to have sent him? The tale, as told, will not hold water: if the said "joke" was ever made, and if this mysterious *Excelsior* was really written before Sienna, then it must have been Liszt himself who sprang upon Wagner the news of a halting likeness.—I here may add, that the music of *Parsifal* itself was commenced in autumn 1877, and there is no telling *how* long beforehand the majority of its themes may have been waiting for a work the scenario whereof was drafted twelve years previously.

Yet another version. Not content with the reference on p. 354 of her vol., Frl. Ramann returns to the charge p. 465 *ibid.*: "*Die Glocken* . . . composed 1874. From them R. Wagner took his Parsifalmotiv (see 354) [where she clearly shewed that it was not *Die Glocken* themselves, but a later independent "prelude," and that it also was not the "Parsifalmotiv," but part of the Liebesmahl-theme]. The tale runs that at the first 'Parsifal' rehearsals at Bayreuth, in the midst of conducting, Wagner suddenly called out to Liszt: 'Look out for your head (*Du, pass' auf*), here comes something of yours!' whereupon the latter, when he recognised his theme, replied, 'So it gets heard after all.'" Already, you see, the legend has been shifted on, from the RING rehearsals (406 *ant.*); the next Liszt-caricaturist will transplant it to the Bayreuth *Tristan*, and put it in the mouth of Wagner's ghost—Liszt having absented himself from the Munich production. But this version really goes an inch too far: in the midst of conducting, "*während des Dirigirens*," Wagner is said to have shouted a warning about a theme that absolutely *starts* the work! For argument's sake, suppose Liszt to have come in late; can you conceive his friend insulting his cassock with a joke, on the brink of the words "Nehmet hin mein Blut"? Can you conceive an Abbé semi-publicly responding to it in such a tone? More than a deficient sense of humour is bewrayed by the inventor of this "tale"—a deficient sense of decency.

Whence sprang the original myth, though? Alas! from the following autograph inscription (reproduced by both the Nuremberg

colleagues) at the head of a string-quartet entitled "*Am Grabe Rich. Wagner's*," composed May 1883 :—

"Rich. Wagner once reminded me of the resemblance of his 'Parsifalmotive' with an earlier-written 'Excelsior' (Introduction to the 'Bells of the Strassburg Minster').

"May that memory be continued herewith. He fulfilled (*vollbracht*) the Great and Glorious in the Art of our age!

"Weimar, 22. May 1883. F. LISZT."

L. Ramann and A. Göllerich unite in telling us that "*At the Grave of Rich. Wagner*" is composed "for string-quartet (with harp ad lib.), or organ, or pianoforte," the "or"s making that part of the description perfectly unintelligible; whilst G. goes on: "The brief composition weaves the 'Excelsior' strains with the so-called 'Liebesmahl-Spruch' from Wagner's 'Parsifal'; afar there shimmers the Grail-motive from Lohengrin, and the Parsifal-bells ring out the whole in peace." Could Liszt not have left those "strains" to speak for themselves on the first posthumous anniversary of his comrade's birth? Taste, as we know, is not to be argued with; but, in his own last Will, Liszt solemnly invites the analogy of Goethe and Schiller. Accepting that analogy 'without prejudice,' can we imagine Goethe inserting those two words "written earlier" in an ode to the memory of a friend scarce cold in the earth? Goethe who refused to look upon his dead friend in the coffin, lest "a disfigured mask" should obliterate the mental picture of his living face.

Ah me! if an aged chieftain's recollection that the *Excelsior* and other themes were "written earlier" had only been more certain, there might have been no need of all these legends. For priority was upheld in only one direction by the Nuremberg school, gratuitously disputed in another, and this is what L. Ramann adds officiously to "Liszt's" aforesaid *Harold* essay, a footnote to p. 68 of *F. Liszt's Ges. Schr.* IV. (pubd 1882): "In his two symphonies—the '*Sinfonie fantastique*' or '*Épisode de la vie d'un artiste*' and the 'Harold'—BERLIOZ appears as the inventor of the Leitmotiv, which MEYERBEER, then R. WAGNER took over from him and was developed by the latter to a musical-dramatic system. The earliest Leitmotiv shews itself in the '*S. fantastique*' in the melodic phrase named by BERLIOZ '*L'idée fixe*.'—The Ed." I decline to present L. R. with a single comma after "him," as the amorphousness of the whole sentence itself is symptomatic: in feverish anxiety to rob R. Wagner of something he never had claimed, not only syntax, but patriotism and historic truth are cast to the wind.

At least two Englishmen have been juster to Germany's musical inventiveness. In vol. iii of *Grove's Dict.* (pubd 1883) F. Corder writes: "The 'Leit-motif' is an ingenious device to overcome the objection that music cannot paint actualities. If a striking phrase

once accompanies a character or an event in an opera, such a phrase will surely be ever afterwards identified with what it first accompanied. The 'Zamiel motive' in 'Der Freischütz' is a striking and early example of this association of phrase with character"; and W. S. Rockstro, though with some exaggeration, in vol. ii (1880), "The constant use of the *Leitmotif*, throughout the whole of this remarkable opera, seems indeed to entitle Weber to the honour of its invention, notwithstanding the suggestive notes sung by the Statue in 'Il Don Giovanni.'" If the French may claim independent invention thereof, it is due to Hérold, of whom *Grove's* vol. iv (1889) remarks in an appendix: "LEITMOTIF. Among other instances of the use of what is practically a 'leading motive' apart from the advanced school of composers, should be mentioned 'La Clochette' of Hérold [1817], in which the melody 'Me voilà' allotted to Lucifer, appears at every entrance of the character. See Rev. et Gazette Mus., for 1880, p. 227." Clearly then, in no respect can either Berlioz or Meyerbeer be credited with this priority. Even had Berlioz' advocates been able to substantiate a claim whereof his reputation for originality stands in no manner of need, it would have little to do with the application to Drama of what is really one of the earliest principles of Symphonic or Sonata form; whilst Meyerbeer's famous *Huguenots* example is of the very crudest—a ready-made and well-known tune adopted as a kind of livery for a routine stage-character, much as if one gave an Englishman the iteration of *God save the King* in an opera dealing with the war for American independence. To *Weber* had both Berlioz and Meyerbeer most plainly gone for their idea. It lacked little more than the Berlin court-theatre's enterprisingness, and BEETHOVEN himself might have preceded them; after the production of *Freischütz* in 1821, in 1822-3 Beethoven was in treaty with Grillparzer for the libretto of an opera on the subject "Melusine," and Grillparzer suggested "an easily-seizable melody to recur at Melusine's each appearance or agency" (*Die Musik*, Beethoven-number 1904).

It would be far outside my present or possible limits, to track the *Leitmotiv* idea to its origin. With Ballads, words and music, we find it in the fixed refrain; SHAKESPEARE we find using it in Drama, as a recent writer (Hugo Conrat) has pointed out, e.g. in the "sennets, tuckets, flourishes" of *King Lear*, differentiated tunes as proved by Gloucester's words act ii, "Hark, the duke's trumpets! I know not why he comes." Consequently we might have to go right back, through bugle-calls, to aboriginal war-cries. But the Wagnerian application needs no recondite research. Before he had heard either Meyerbeer's *Huguenots* or one note of Berlioz' music, he knew by heart what *they* knew quite well by ear and eye, *Don Giovanni* and *Der Freischütz;* ere ever he set foot in Paris, he had carved in signs

more enduring than brass a most distinct and typical *Leitmotiv*, to wit, in *Rienzi*. That this was not his first, is shewn by the rescued fragment of his early *Hochzeit* (1832—see i, 143); but I purposely confine myself to a work consultation whereof was emphatically incumbent on any presumer to add such a note affecting Wagner to a standard edition of his friend's Collected Writings. The *Rienzi* overture, of which the said 'leading motive' constitutes the first 4 bars, was not written, as we know, till autumn 1840; but composition of the first and second acts was finished ere Wagner left Riga in June 39, and even their scoring by Sept. 12 of that year (at Boulogne —see vol. i). Well, in act i we have that theme appearing at Rienzi's words, "Mahne mich nicht an Blut," with reference to the Nobles' murder of his brother; in act ii a modification thereof preceding the Nobles' terzet, "So wäre denn auf ihn allein der Streich zu führen"; and several recurrences of the theme immediately after their attempt on the hero's life, conspicuously at his words, "Was willst du, düstre Mahnung, mir?" We meet the theme in later acts, but, those having been composed in Paris, I will take no advantage of them; on the other hand, the lopped modern pfte-scores may possibly have deprived us of additional examples in the pre-Parisian pair of acts. But the repetition of a highly characteristic theme at moments of like emotional significance is amply established by the instances just cited, whilst the meaning of the theme is thereby made as clear as day: it is a Vendetta-motive—what one may term a *Stimmung*-phrase, the very essence of Wagner's later system, as against a mere cockade attached to a stock character's costume. Its style shews its source, *Don Giovanni* or *Der Freischütz;* young Richard was following in the footsteps of his best-loved operatic models. There are other themes recurrent in *Rienzi;* but those, I think, are more purely 'reminiscences'; *this* is a bonâ-fide 'motive,' self-created, worthy to rank with any of its successors. What need for a composer who thus had already struck his own distinctive path, to go to the *Huguenots* or *Harold* for a prompting?

Now, Liszt may not have studied *Rienzi* enough, to make this palpable discovery himself, and therefore may have been of the same opinion as L. Ramann; but, with *Parsifal* on the eve of production, we may be sure he would never have blurted that opinion out in so aggressive a manner. Let us turn the tables. Imagine that to a 100-page essay by Wagner, let us say the *Beethoven*, Nietzsche had added in proof-correction one solitary would-be historical note (its solitariness makes L. R.'s the more glaring); imagine that note appended to a discussion of the Pastoral symphony, and running as follows: "In this symphony BEETHOVEN appears as the inventor of Programme-music, which MENDELSSOHN, then F. LISZT took over from him" (*von ihm übernahm*) etc. Only imagine it, and you can see Rome, Weimar

and Nuremberg up in arms at once, for much less cause ; but—your mind's eye can also see the whole edition cancelled by Wagner, and a reprimand administered to "the Editor" such as he would not forget till his dying day.

We will wipe the taste from our mouth with something of Wagner's own :—"Liszt used to polish off the like stupid suggestions [of another kind] with the remark that cigar-ash and sawdust steeped in aqua fortis didn't make pleasant soup" (*P.* VI. 184.—Nov. 1879) ; and, "In the *Flying Dutchman* the reappearance of a theme still had often the mere character of an absolute Reminiscence—a device already employed by other composers before me" (*P.* I. 371—the German being, "*in welchem diess schon vor mir bei anderen Komponisten vorgekommen war*"). I must refer you to the context, and to *Opera and Drama*, for an explanation of the change our hero introduced ; but this will suffice to prove how little he claimed to rank as author of the 'representative theme,' alias 'leitmotif,' in its bare simplicity.

INDEX TO VOLUME IV.

In this index figures denoting the tens and hundreds are not *repeated* for one and the same reference, excepting where the numerals run into a fresh line of type; "*n*", following a numeral, signifies "footnote"; whilst "-," takes the place of the more cumbrous "*et seq.*": thus

Art and Politics, 64-5, 73, 80, 7, 90, 101, 5*n*, 9, 13, 5-, 21, 6, will stand for Art and Politics, 64-65, 73, 80, 87, 90, 101, 105 *note*, 109, 113, 115 *et seq.*, 121, 126.

N.B. In German names K and C are often interchangeable.

A.

Actors and Singers, 148, 200, 3, 5*n*, 213, 58-9, 71-3, 303, 72, 400-, 55, 475, 84, 9. See also RING (Representation).
Agthe, Frl., 478, see Milde.
Albani, Mme, 454.
Alberich, 4, 12, 5, 23, 35-7, 49, 64, 72*n*, 180, 1, 365, 427-; Curse, 14, 56, 59, 213, 338, 81-, 428, 33; "light and dark," 37. See Hagen; Wanderer.
Albisbrunn, 65, 151.
Alboni, 454.
Albrecht, Weimar printer, 478, 82.
Alexandre (harmonium), 171.
Allg. d. Musik-Verein, 406.
Allg. M.-Gesellschaft, see Zurich.
Allg. Musikzeitung, 106*n*, 31*n*, 87*n*, 492*n*.
Allgemeine Zeitung, 164*n*.
Alps, 188, see Bernese Ob.
Altenburg (Weimar), 79, 250, 65, 88, 304, 10, 46, 446, 500-1.
Altmann, Dr W., 312*n*, 23*n*, 6-, 31*n*, 339*n*, 45, 50*n*, 489-, 92*n*, 6, 8.
America, 385*n*, 413, 512; proposal to W., 211, 2.
Amfortas, 482.
Anders, E., 172*n*.
Applause, 110-, 30, 48, 204, 53, 90, 300, 37, 40*n*, 508.
Aptommas (harpist), 513.
Arban (cornet-player), 161*n*.
Art and Life, 119, 23, 7, 33, 8, 48, 151, 5, 6, 70, 5-7, 89, 215, 27, 371, 394, 417, 48, 51-3, 76.

Art and Politics, 64-5, 73, 80, 7, 90, 101, 5*n*, 9, 13, 5-, 21, 6, 42, 214-5, 224-5, 307-8, 29, 42-5, 55, 7, 69-70, 445, 6, 93*n*, 5.
Assing, Ludmilla, 89.
Auber, *Lac des Fées*, 312.
Augsburg theatre, 149*n*, 223.
Austria, Emperor, 356.
Avenarius, E. & C. (R. W.'s sister), 335, 7, 9, 44*n*, 65.

B.

Bach, 178*n*, 408; *Chaconne*, 165.
Bacher, Dr, 454-62.
Baden, Gd Duchess, 136; Prince Regent, 136, 7, 59, 61, 6.
Baden, Liszt at, 161-3, 4*n*.
Badenweiler (Black Forest), 147.
Baechtold's *G. Keller*, 152*n*.
Baldur, 431.
Balfe, 248*n*, 513.
Ballenstedt festival, 158, 61, 5, 201*n*.
Balmung (=Nothung), 46.
Balzac's *Fille d'Eve*, 249-52, 6, 7*n*.
Banck, Carl, 161.
Bandsmen, 94, 105-6, 10-3, 28, 61*n*, 162, 96, 7*n*, 219, 307, 474-5, 508.
Baneux, horn-player, 161*n*.
Banquet to Wagner, 112-3.
Basle, 105; reunion, 154-8, 66-9, 73, 192, 8, 9, 307, 470, 99.
Baumgartner, W., 73, 112, 7, 33, 9, 147.
Bayreuth, 441: Theatre, 10, 115, 387-8; *Holländer* at, 245, 65*n*, 7, 305; *Parsifal* rehearsals, 517; *Ring*

at, 73, 401-3—rehearsals, 385*n*, 406, 416, 517.
Bayreuther Blätter, 6*n*, 17*n*, 9*n*, 27*n*, 30, 31*n*, 5, 70*n*, 92, 247*n*, 73*n*, 89*n*, 301, 12*n*, 29*n*, 85*n*, 6, 97*n*, 424, 466, 73, 83, 514, 6.
Bayr. Taschen-Kalender, 487*n*.
Beck (tenor), 341, 475.
Becker, J. A., 85.
Beethoven, 378, 446: Concert-aria, 165; *Coriolanus*, 514; *Egmont*, 194, 219, 36, 514; *Fidelio*, 243, 8, 458*n*; *Melusine* (opera projected), 519; Quartets, last, 170-1, 7, 266, 417; Sonatas, 131, 68, 78*n*, 408, 49, 53, 511.
Beethoven's Symphonies, 131, 83, 218*n*, 511*n*: Eroica, 94, 132; Fourth, 194; C minor, 132, 93; Pastoral, 219, 378, 520; Seventh, 94, 219, 366-, 478; Eighth, 208, 219, 501*n*; Ninth, 129-30, 63, 5, 166*n*, 495*n*.
Behrend, H. (Danzig), 69*n*.
Bellini, *Romeo*, 149*n*, 247, 457, 65.
Bénazet (Baden band), 161*n*.
Berlin Court-theatre, 318, 455-7, 500-1, 504-5, 19; archives, 312*n*, 3-, 489-. See *Tannh.*
Berlin: Königstädter theatre, 101; Kroll's, see K.
Berlin, Wagner-concerts proposed, 102, 306-11, 93, 499*n*.
Berliner Tageblatt, 85.
Berlioz, 139, 61*n*, 91, 9, 248*n*, 370, 390, 2*n*, 508, 13, 4; *Cellini*, 139, 288*n*, 469*n*; *Enfance du Christ*, 241*n*, 392*n*; *Fantastique* and *Harold*, 518-20; *Romeo*, 165; and Wagner, 156, 67*n*, 9-71.
Berne, 105, 6, 56, 366, 8-70.
Bernese Oberland, 132*n*, 5, 367, 478.
Bernina, 151.
Bettina von Arnim, 90*n*, 304, 446-7.
Betz, Franz, 400, 92*n*.
Beust, von, 115, 9, 26, 229, 343, 55.
Bevers, Engadine, 151.
Biel, 105.
Birch Hirschfeld, 480.
Birch-Pfeiffer, Charlotte, 120*n*.
Bischoff (Cologne), 364, 72.
Bodmer-Stocker, 105.
Boieldieu, *Dame blanche*, 247, 8.
Boileau, 236.
Boito, letter to, 157.
Bonaparte, 96, 406.
Boosey (pub.), 266*n*
Bost (singer), 501.
Boston concerts, 211, 2.
Bote und Bock (pub.), 205, 313-4, 498.
Boulevard des Italiens, 172.
Bovet, Alfred, 441.
Brahms, 136*n*, 68*n*; on Wagner, 217, 510.
'Brain-fag,' 154; see Wagner (eye-strain).
Brandus (pub.), 454, 69*n*.
Brassin (barytone), 200.
Breitkopf & Härtel, 97, 8, 238*n*, 43, 5, 438, 51, 70-3, 514; see also H.
Brema, Marie, 403.
Bremen theatre, 149*n*.
Brendel, Franz, 79, 96, 7, 143, 91, 201*n*, 34-7, 45-9, 52, 8*n*, 60*n*, 8, 335, 6, 45, 61, 92*n*, 407*n*, 67, 505.
Breslau, 189*n*, 206*n*, 455; see *Holl.*
Briefe hervorragenden Zeitgenossen an F. Liszt, 120, 37*n*, 65*n*, 8*n*, 310, 438, 47, *et passim.*
British Musem, 8*n*, 234*n*, 97, 8*n*, 470.
Brockhaus, H., 332, 97, 482.
Bromberg theatre, 102.
'Brüderschaft,' 145, 7, 67, 340*n*.
Brunhild (Dorn's), 500-5.
Brunnen, Lake of Lucerne, 132, 45.
Brünnhilde, see Bryn.
Brussels, 358*n*; concert schemes, 301, 389-93, 6.
Brynhild, 22, 3, 81, 379-82, 401-4, 412-6, 32, 4, 7-8:—in *S. Tod*, act i, 45-6, 58, 261, 2; act ii, 48-9, 57-8, 379; act iii, 50-2, 61-4, 446—see *Gtdg.*
Buddhism, 92-3, *cf.* 264*n*.
Bülow, Edouard von, 116, 288*n*; death, 163-4.
Bülow, Hans von, 68*n*, 9*n*, 73, 4*n*, 115-6, 20, 60-9, 280, 6, 7, 90, 306, 307, 504: articles, 135*n*, 7*n*, 225*n*, 241, 363, 505; compositions, 505-510; Corr. with Liszt, 125, 65, 8*n*, 170*n*, 1, 209, 32, 6, 307-9, 34, 41*n*, 345, 51-2*n*, 64-5, 7, 89-91, 5, 440, 469-73, 99*n*, 501*n*, 8-10; mother and sister, 116, 54, 63*n*, 92*n*, 202*n*, 304*n*, 469; pfte arrgmts, 192, 221, 232, 468-73; virtuoso tours, 116, 61, 288, 500, 1*n*, 10; Wagner writes, 280, 397, 505-10.
Bund, Berne, 369.
Bundestag, German, 116, 22.
Bürger's ballads, 254*n*, 63.
Burghold, Dr Julius, 379, 80, 2*n*, 412-4.

C.

Calvé, Mme, 273.
Campbell, Lord, 463-5.
Carl, Frl. (soprano), 505.
Carlsbad, 147*n*, 61.
Carlsruhe festival, 108*n*, 36-7, 47, 54, 156, 8-67, 73, (204), 393, 509; theatre, 136, 59-60, 4, 205*n*, 6*n*.
Carlyle, 23*n*.
Carolyne, Pss, see Wittgenstein.
"Carolyszt," ,, ,,
Cassel theatre, 215, 45, 78.
Castalli, tenor, 109.
Chamberlain, H. S., 41-4, 81, 95*n*, 245.
Chancery, Eng. Court, 455*n*, 7, 61-3.
Chaux-de-Fonds, 105.
Chelard, conductor, 248*n*.
Chemnitz, 337.
Chopin, 140, 235, 8, 513.
Choral unions, 54, 106, 10, 7, 307-8.
Chorus, 45, 9, 53, 4, 64, 129, 201-2, 226, 65-6, 366, 9*n*, 402*n*, 77, 500-4, 512.
Chrêtien de Troyes, 480.
Chriemhild, 81, 2, 439, 99-505.
Chur (=Coire), 110, 50.
Cimabue's Madonna, 290.
Coburg-Gotha, Duke Ernst's opera, 120-2, 236, 313, 5.
Cologne, 190*n*, 206*n*, 331*n*, 71-3, 462, 95.
Como, Lake, 141.
Concerts, 102, 48-9, 61, 89-90*n*, 201*n*, 211, 2, 26, 301, 6-11, 63, 89-93, 6, 417, 517; see Festivals, Gewandhaus, Zurich.
Conrat, Hugo, 519.
Constitutionnel, 392*n*.
Conversations-Lexikon, 332, 3*n*.
Corder, F., 518.
Cornelius, Peter, 166-7, 8*n*, 200, 37, 240-5, 52, 62*n*, (310).
Cossmann, B., 407*n*.
Costa, Michael, 454.
Coutts' bank, 463.
Critics, friendly, 13, 66, 7, 71, 4-91, 106-13, 29, 43, 81, 96, 201-5, 13-4, 226-7, 55, 62-79, 303-5, 72, 92*n*, 401-3, 25-6, 38-48, 67-8, 88, 501*n*.
Critics, hostile, 67-70, 6-7, 82, 5, 6, 113, 52*n*, 66, 70, 89*n*, 91, 6, 9, 303, 61, 86-7, 90, 401, 12-3, 51, 65.
Crompton, Justice, 465.
Cruvelli, Sophie (singer), 248*n*.
Cuts, 204-5*n*, 77, 402, 75-6.

D.

Daland, 259-60, 7; music, 269*n*.
Damm (Weimar band), 113.
"Daniel Sterne," 238.
Dannreuther, Edward, 7*n*.
Dante, 141, 253*n*, 5.
Darmstadt theatre, etc., 160-3, 302, 317.
Darwinian theory, 22.
David (violinist), 200.
Dedications, 131, 208*n*, 364*n*; see RING.
Delafield, 454.
Della Casa (?), 152.
Dent & Co., J. M. (pub.), 249*n*.
Deutsche Allgemeine (Brockhaus), 115, 202-3.
Deutsche Rundschau, 84.
Devrient, Eduard, 116, 36, 47, 58-60, 164, 205*n*.
Dietsch, *Vaisseau fantôme*, 270.
Dingelstedt, F., 223-5, 315.
Diplomas, 116-7, 42, 332-3, 92*n*, 9.
Dog, see Peps.
Donizetti, *Favorite*, 247.
Donner, 9, 15, (151), 195, 365, 80.
Dorn, Heinrich, 216, 307-11, 2*n*, 8-20, 324, 5, 49, 57, 451, 94-8; letters to Liszt, 310, 3, 499-501; *Nibelungen* opera, 70, 308-11, 94*n*, 498-505.
Draeseke, Felix, 168*n*.
DRAMA, Evolution of WAGNERIAN, 81, 110, 243-4, 53, 68-71, 7, 300-2, 5, 400-2, 5, 16, 39, 40, 8, 67, 76, 88, 507, 10, 9-21. See also RING.
Dresden, 152, 61, 210, 337, 41-3; Insurrection, 51, 87, 121, 6, 7, 58, 342, 5, 469-70*n*; Theatre, 190, 206*n*, 9, 23, 79*n*, 81, 4, 372, 456, 497, 8.
Dumas père, 236.

E.

Eagle symbol, 233, 324, 60, *cf.* 137.
Eastern philosophy, 92-3, 264*n*; *cf.* 88, 446.
Echo, Berlin, 85.
Eckhardt (Dresden band), 211.
Eddas, 27*n*, 33, 9, 81-2, 425, 31, 3, 438, 9.
Ehrlich, 472.
Eisenach, 144; Wagner at, 121.
Elegante Welt, 94*n*.
Elsa, 249, 61-2, 404, 84, 9.
Engel (conductor), 102, 306.
,, & Co., 458.

England's "reward," 458-65; see London.
Erard pianoforte, 172.
Erda: *Rheingold*, 11-4, 86, 214, 433, 435, 41; *Siegfried*, 14, 58, 63*n*, 88, 379, 80, 428, 31-5.
Erfurt, bass-clarinet, 200.
Erik (*Holl.*), 247*n*, 56-8, 63, 9.
Erl (tenor), 189*n*.
Erle, Justice, 465.
Ernst, Alfred, 383*n*.
,, H. W. (violinist), 173.
Eschenbach, see Wolfram.
Escher, Dr Alfred, 105.
,, -Hess, M., ,,
,, -Zollikofer, ,,
Eschmann, J. C., 135, 9.
Ettersburg, near Weimar, 146*n*.
Ettmüller, E. M. L., 73, 6.
Etymology, 129.
Etzel (=Attila), 502-4.
Europa (journal), 81.
Evolution, Natural, 22, 444.

F.

Fafner, 26-9, 34, 6-7, 68, 214, 423-4, 430, 45; death, 30, 7, 56, 8, 9, 427, (502).
Fasolt, 9, 13*n*, 36-7, 214.
Faust, Goethe's, 87, 250, 62, 443; "*Ur-*," 66.
Faust-overture, orig., 280, 514; revision, 300, 417, 511, 4 —perfd Leipzig, 196*n*; Bülow's pfte version, 468.
Fear (in Ring), 12-5, 26-34, 59, 91*n*, 382, 414, 21-6, 30, 3, 5, 8, 44; mus. theme, 31, 405*n*.
Federlein, Gottlieb, 385*n*, (413).
Feen, Die, 511, 3.
Festivals, 265; see Bayreuth, Carlsruhe, Rotterdam, Sitten, Zurich.
Fétis, 364, 90, 2*n*.
Feuerbach, 90, 213, 397*n*.
Finck, H. T., 184, 216, 334*n*.
Fire, see Loge.
Fischbacher (pub.), 401.
Fischer, Wilhelm (Dresden), 49, 73, 98, 114, 26, 49*n*, 54, 6, 9*n*, 82, 4, 208-9, 21, 5*n*, 30, 85-9, 93, 8*n*, 336, 41, 50, 71, 91, 412, 69.
Flaxland (pub.), (300), 470.
Fliegender Holländer, see H.
Flosshilde, 9, 179; see Rhine-daughters.
Flotow, *Indra*, 312.
Forman, Alfred, 16, 9*n*, 20, 92, 375*n*, 383*n*.
Formes, T. (tenor), 357, 501.
Frankfort, 3, 337; theatre, 85, 106, 136, 47-9, 282*n*, 302, 474.
Franz, Robt., 135, 7, 513.
Frauenstädt, 70, 84, 5, 441.
Freia themes, 193, 375, 8.
Freiburg i. B., 101, 5-6.
French language, 169.
Fricka, 12, 5, 8-24, 58, 74, 87, 193, 396, 400-4, 10, 33, 8, 42.
Frisch (bandsman), 475.
Fritzsch (pub.), 450.
Froh, 15, 47; mus. entry, 193.
Frommann, Alwine, 69, 73, 337, 9, 348-52; Wagner writes, 343-5, 9-51.
Fuessli, Orell & Co., 95.
Fünf Gedichte, 450.
Fürstner, Adolph, 298*n*.

G.

Garcia, Manuel, 152.
Gazette Musicale, 69, 519.
Gegenwart, 76-7, 111, 52-3, 219, 397*n*.
Geibel, E. von, *Brunhild*, 70*n*.
Gemmi pass, 367.
Genast, Eduard, 475, 8.
Genoa, 156, 7.
Geology, 65, 151.
George Eliot, 254*n*.
Gerber, E., 498, 501.
German language, 237-9, 42.
Gervinus, 413.
Gesture, 184, 258-9, 403, 88-9.
Gewandhaus concerts, 196-7, 201*n*, 204*n*, 472.
'Ghosts,' 120-2, 83, 236, 9, 48, 56, 262*n*, 5, 471.
Giants (Ring), 36-7, 72*n*, 193, 231, 427, 8; see Fafner.
Glasenapp, C. F., vi, 70*n*, 7*n*, 152*n*, 300, 47, 94*n*.
Gluck, 243, 70, 1, 319, 21: *Armida*, 163; *Iph. in Aulis*, at Dresden, 372,—overture, 218, 9, 361-4, 417—new closes by Mozart and Wagner, 364.
Goethe, 236, 328, 446, see *Faust*.
Goethe-Schiller = (?) Liszt-Wagner, 133, 46*n*, 328-9, 51, 499, 504, 18.
Göllerich, August, 166*n*, 406-7, 8*n*, 510-8.
Golther, Dr Wolfgang, 66*n*, 301, 411, 436*n*.
Gotha, 120, 36, 236, 313, 5, 56.

GÖTTERDÄMMERUNG :—
Music, 45, 62, 170, 82, 378-81, 415-416; prelude, 363; trio (act ii), 47-9, 503.
Poem, 8, 9-10*n*, 18, 9*n*, 39-66, 88, 90, 261, 2, 432, 43, 6, 85*n*, 503; Brynhild's farewell words, 19*n*, 50-3, 61-4, 80, 8, 91-3, 289, 379, 446; Siegfried's death-scene, 43, 53, 60-1, (*cf.* 81); Woodbird-songs, 49-50, 4, 9*n*. [For further details see S. Tod.]
Gottwald, H., 74*n*.
Götze, tenor, 167*n*.
,, Musikdirektor, 287.
Grail, Holy, 108, 478-82; mus. themes, 379, 487*n*, 515, 8.
Greek Tragedy, 89, 362, 416.
Grenzboten, 69, 252.
Grillparzer, 519.
Grimm, Brothers, 90*n*, 446, 7.
,, (?), 474.
Grisi, Mme, 454.
Gross, Adolf von, 487*n*.
Grove's Dictionary of Music, 7*n*, 135*n*, 248*n*, 368*n*, 453-4, 95*n*, 518-9.
Grütli (Lake of Lucerne), 145.
Guillaume, Jules, 392*n*.
Guiraud, E., 470.
Gurney, Edmund, 412-3.
Gutrune, 44, 8.
Gye, Fredk., 453-65.
,, Ernest, 454.

H.

Habeneck, 112.
Hagen, 502-4; and Alberich, 46, 56-59, 65; trio, 47-9, 503; Watch, 45, 182.
Hagenbuch, Franz, 112.
Hamburg, 389, 456-62; Fire, 139; theatre, 155, 206*n*.
Handel, *Israel*, 265, 367.
Hanfstängl, 98.
Hanover theatre, 164*n*, 206*n*.
Harmony, mus., 178-82, 226, 31, 65, 269, 94, 408, 10-1, 51-2, 67, 87*n*, 505-10, 6.
Härtels, 68, 9, 71, 189-92, 4, 7-8, 207, 335-6; see also Breitkopf.
Härtiger, tenor, 224.
Hâvamâl (Edda), 27*n*, 33, 425.
Haydn, 452, 510; *Seasons*, 367; Symphony, 194.
Hayn, A. W. (pub.), 397.
Hebbel's *Nibelungen*, 70*n*, 499.
Heidelberg, 89, 161.
Heim, Emilie, 109, 12, 3, 39, 60, 2.
,, Ignaz, 112, 39.
Heine, F., 4, 73, 94, 7-9, 105, 14, 151, 89*n*, 95*n*, 7, 8, 208; son Wilhelm, 114.
Heine, Heinrich, 142*n*; *Salon*, 245-6.
Heinefetter, Kathinka, 165.
Heintz, A., 178*n*, 82, 276*n*, 412, 3*n*.
Henning, Berlin Kplmstr, 490-1.
Heraclitus, 23*n*.
Hermann, conjurer, 139, 43, 7, 63.
"Hero" illusion, 15, 381; see Wotan's Gedanke.
Hérold, 519.
Herrenburger, Frau (singer), 501.
Herwegh, Emma, 76-7, 110-1, 32, 40, 145, 7, 51-3, 397*n*.
Herwegh, Georg, 73, 97, 128-30, 2, 139-41, 4-7, 50-4, 365, 97*n*; opin. of RING, 75-7.
Hettner, Hermann, 89.
Hettstedt, Frau (singer), 478.
Heuberger, R., 217.
Hiller, Ferd., 372.
Hinrichs, R., Franz' brother-in-law, 137*n*.
Hirschfeld, Birch, 480.
Hoard, 502, 4; and Ring, 11, 29, 36-37, 56, 7, 423, 7, 9.
Hochberg, Count, 489.
Hochzeit, Die, 520.
Höck (Weimar machinist), 478.
Hoffmann, Johann, 334*n*.
Holdermann (Weimar scene-painter), 478.
Holland, 389-91, 2*n*, 9.
HOLLÄNDER, DER FLIEGENDE :—
Cuts proposed (Weimar), 277, 83.
Entractes, 266-8, 490.
Fee, 492.
Hero, 247, 50, 3, 9, 61, 3, 4*n*, 72, 295; monologue, 254, 64, 70, 4, 276, 94.
Motives, mus., 167, 78*n*, 267, 9, 275-6, 92-300, 521.
Motto, 174.
Overture, 292-, 362, 514; close (variants), 281-6, 95-302, 40; at Leipzig, 196*n*, Zurich, 107, 8, 340.
Performances :—Berlin, 245, 72, 4, 281, 339*n*, 43*n*, 489-92; Breslau and Schwerin, 284-6, 302; Darmstadt, 302; Dresden (orig.), 245, 272, 9*n*, 81, 91; Frankfort, 85; Wiesbaden, 209; Zurich, 94, 101, 103, 9*n*, 260, 72, 4, 80-2, 6, 302, 40, 473-4.

HOLLÄNDER, DER FLIEGENDE—*continued.*
Pfte and vocal scores, 265, 6*n*, 297, 9; French edition, 300-1.
Picture, 245, 58-9, 72.
Poem, 3, 91, 177, 253, 63, 77; first form, 245, 67, 490; read at Zurich, 106-7.
and *Rienzi*, 231, 68-9, 79.
and *Ring*, 3, 277, 305.
Score, full, 265*n*, 76, 97-9, 490; revisions, 209, 69*n*, 78, 80-9, 91, 299*n*, 300-2; supposed gift to Liszt, 283, 7-8, 91—real, 289-90; Weimar confusion, 276, 80-9, 91, 302-4.
Seamen's chorus, 297, 8*n*; at Zurich, 107, 9*n*, 10, 3, 7.
Senta's Ballad, 245, 59, 74, 6, 93*n*, 294*n*, 6, 7, 305; at Zurich, 107, 109*n*.
Spinning-chorus, 245, 66, 7, 97, 8*n*.
Spread (*i.e.* non-), 190, 246-8, 53, 268-70, 4, 9-82, 302-4, 90, 8.
Weimar production, 73*n*, 120, 258-260, 6, 70, 3-4, 7-91, 304; repetitions, 79, 139, 200, 98, 304, 40
Holländer-essay, Carolyszt's, 234-77, 291-8, 302-5, 40*n*:—
Double chorus (act iii), 265, 90*n*.
Duet (act ii), 260-2, 4, 9, 74-7.
Edit. L. Ramann, 237-46, 54*n*, 6*n*, 258*n*, 9*n*, 61*n*, 2*n*, 71*n*, 3*n*, 4*n*, 275-6*n*, 95*n*, 6*n*, 8*n*, 302*n*; music-examples, 246, 75-6*n*, 93*n*.
Erik-blot, 256-7, 63, 9.
"Fatrasies," 237, 47*n*, 8, 303, 15.
Liszt's share in, 247*n*, 52-4, 60, 3, 264-77, 91-8, 302-5.
Overture, on, 242, 52, 63, 4, 5, 276, 291-8, 302-3.
Stage-directions, liberties, 257-60.
Wagner on, 249, 52, 5-6, 64, 304-305, 47, 95-6.
Hornstein, R. von, 85, 8.
Hôtel Baur, see Zurich.
,, Three Kings, Basle, 166-8.
,, des Princes, Paris, 169-72.
Howitz-Steinan, sopr., 165.
Hueffer, Dr Francis, 177*n*, 314, 28*n*, 347, 50*n*, 2*n*, 4*n*, 65*n*.
HULDIGUNGS-MARSCH, 468.
Hülsen, Botho von, 101-2, 234, 307, 311-, 89, 491-8; and Minna, 339, 342-5, 54:—Corresp. with: Liszt, 315-7, 9-23, 6-9, 31-2, 8, 53, 8; Albert Wagner, 323, 5-7; Richard W., 312*n*, 54, 8, 492-7.
Hunding, 17, 8, 20-1, 366, 73, 4, 405, 411*n*, 42; sons, 55, 60, 437.

I.

Ibsen, 256.
Illustrirte, Leipziger, 97, 8, 246, 482.
Indian poem, 253-4*n*, *cf.* 264*n*.
Inspiration, musical, 157, 74, 6, 84*n*, 187-8, 93, 5, 382, 6, 95*n*, 401, 13*n*, 415-6.
Interlaken, 135.
Interpreters, 5, 12-4, 32, 45, 64-6, 91, 143, 213-4, 303, 75-6, 82-8, 95*n*, 402-4, 67-8.
Isabella, Queen of Spain, 321*n*.
Italy, 155-7, 76, 98; singers, 152, 272-3.

J.

Jacobi (Albert W.'s son-in-law), 459*n*.
Jahn, Otto, 191.
Jameson, Fredk., (16), 375*n*, 83*n*.
Japan, 114.
Jesuits, 228.
Jews, 3, 76, 138, 41, 53, 91, 4, 206, 228, 338, 507.
Joachim, Joseph, 135, 7, 63-7, 367-8; orch. comp., 508-10; violin-concerto, 165.
Jordan's *Sigfried*, 70*n*, 499.
Joseph of Arimathea, 481.
Julier pass, Engadine, 151.
Jullien, Adolphe, 95.
,, , L. A., concerts, 211*n*.

K.

KAISERMARSCH, 450.
Kalergis, Mme, 162-3, 70, 2.
Kalliwoda, conductor, 163.
Kapellmeisters, 106, 20, 39, 61, 3, 204*n*, 25, 48*n*, 307, 8*n*, 10-1, 8, 320, 7, 30, 9, 56, 72, 4, 7, 8, 91, 394-5, 8, 508; Wagner still miscalled, 104, 15, 20.
Kastner's catalogue, 335*n*.
Kaufhold, tenor, 473-4.
Keller, Gottfried, 152*n*; on *Ring*, 76-7, 89.
Keller, Prof. Karl, 117.
,, , theatre-cashier, 104.
Key, individuality of, 180.
Kiesling, E. (printer), 72.

Kietz, E., 94-8, 172.
Kiot the Provençal, 480, 2*n*.
Kirchner, Heinrich, 95.
,, , Theodor, 135, 9.
Klindworth, Carl, 6*n*, 7*n*, 17, 184, 391*n*, 487.
Köhler, Louis, 83, 9, 147*n*, 71, 235, 499, 505; *Melody of Speech*, 84, 153-4*n*, 466-8.
Königsberg, 83, 466; theatre, 190*n*, 314-5, 23, 505; University, 332-3.
Königstein, 148.
Kossak, Ernst, 85.
Kreuzzeitung, 68-70.
Kroll's theatre, Berlin, 101-2, 312.
Krüger, singer, 501.
Kufferath, Maurice, 401-5.
Kummers, the, 135, 9, 47.
Küstner, von, 491.

L.

Lachner, Franz, 106, 224, 5, 304.
Lago Maggiore, 157.
La Mara, 165, 8, 70, 237*n*, 8, 508*n*, 509.
Lampert, Gotha cond., 120-1.
Langer, conductor, 201*n*.
Laporte, manager, 453.
Lassen, E., 392*n*.
Laube, H., 94*n*.
Lausanne, 105.
Layman v. prof. musician, 7, 103, 12, 163, 90*n*, 202, 16, 53, 65-8, 74-5, 385, 95*n*, 467, 8.
Leemann, Robt. (engraver), 98.
Leiningen, Count, 137, 47, 59.
Leipzig, 3, 95, 337, 9, 451; "admirers," 335-6, 61; clique, 69*n*, 191, 7*n*, 9, 200-1*n*, 4*n*, 471-2; *Holl.* score, 281-5, 91; Reichel's Garden, 495*n*, cf. 474; theatre, 101, see *Lohengrin*.
Leitmotive, 31, 373-5, 9*n*, 82-8, 413, 518-21; see Motives.
Lemprière, 253-4*n*.
Lesimple, August, 371-3.
Levi, Hermann, 487*n*.
Lewald, Fanny, 440.
Lichtenstein, K. A. von, 490-1.
Lind, Jenny, 454, 64.
Lindner, Dr, 85.
Lindwurm, 68, 445; see Fafner.
Liszt, Franz, 73, 98, 119, 33, 8-, 47, 152*n*, 8-, 75, 97-, 208, 12, 20, 30, 234-, 373, 440, 94:—
Abbé, 517.
Liszt, Franz—*continued.*
at Bayreuth, 385*n*, 406, 517.
Children, 169-70, 2, 290*n*, 358*n*.
Compositions, mus., 163, 4, 368, 472, 510-8:—*Am Grabe R. W.'s*, 518; *Christus*, 145, 54, 511, 5; *Excelsior*, 511, 5-8; *Faust* sym., 406-10, 511, 4-5; *Graner Messe*, 354, 6; *Künstler* cant., 165, 79, 226-7, 407, 509-10; *Ruins of Athens*, fant., 165; *S. Elisabeth*, 511, 5; Sonata, 354; *Strassburg-Bells*, 515-8; Symph. poems, 248, 303, 58*n*, 361, 407, 512, 4, 20—*Berg*, 511*n*; *Helden-Klage*, 511, 513; *Hungaria*, 265; *Hunnenschlacht*, 511, 5; *Ideale*, 511, 5; *Orpheus*, 511, 4.
Conductor, 166, 7, 73, 97, 226, 98, 307-8, 10, 4-6, 8, 20, 5, 42, 475-476, 94-7.
Corr. with Wagner, 3-4, 83-4, 255, 262-4, 70-2, 322*n*, 4*n*, 496; misarranged letters, 102*n*, 55*n*, 327*n*, 328*n*, 30, 7*n*, 47-9, 50*n*, 514; missing and omissions, 68*n*, 101, 121, 4, 201, 28, 78-9, 328*n*, 31, 335*n*, 7*n*, 9, 41, 6, 8, 54, 7, 92-395, 471, 83, 8; see Reticence.
Diplomacy, 115, 6, 9-26, 36-7, 40, 146, 8, 62-3, 6, 98-203, 10, 23, 9, 248, 303, 7-38, 44*n*, 6, 8, 53, 8, 390, 3-5, 446, 71-3, 99-501, 5.
Inaccuracy and inattention, 69*n*, 84, 126, 41, 3, 62, 4, 245-6, 75-6, 283-8, 91-3, 8, 303, 5*n*, 14, 6, 321-2, 9*n*, 32-3, 52*n*, 92*n*, 482-8.
Letters to Pss Wittgenstein, see W.
Literary works, 145*n*, 235-9, 41*n*, 243*n*, 5, 7, 57, 62*n*, 73*n*, 5*n*, 305*n*, 512-3, 8; *Bohémiens*, 238; Carlsruhe letter, 165-6, 321; *Chopin*, 235, 8; *Egmont*, 236; *Euryanthe*, 235; *Harold*, 512, 3, 8; *Holländer*, see H.; *Loh. et Tannh.*, 107, 236-9, 42*n*, 6, 305*n*, 92*n*, 3, 476, 8, 82, 8; *Rheingold*, 241*n*, 305*n*; signature, 235, 6, 47*n*, 52, 6, 68, 303, cf. 471; translators, 236-43, 62*n*, 488.
Munificence etc., 107, 40, 5, 69*n*, 175, 207, 20, 7, 8*n*, 89-90, 306-309, 16, 33*n*, 41*n*, 59, 447, 94, 5.
Pianoforte-virtuoso, 133, 218, 355-356, 90, 494, 513; plays to Wagner, 140, 7, 68, 78*n*, 377-8, 409-410.

LISZT, FRANZ—*continued.*
Priority alleged, 273*n*, 406-11, 510-518.
Puns etc., 316, 22, 32, 521.
Religion, 124, 38, 45, 236, 64, 354, 356, 517.
Reticence, 82, 119, 20, 6, 98, 212, 227, 8*n*, 9, 36, 48, 55-6, 64, 79-280, 310, 3, 28, 31, 6, 8, 41, 6, 348, 54, 7, 401, 71, 2, 88.
Ring, opin. of, 79-80, 305*n*, 440, 7, 448.
Singers, on, 148, 269-74.
Susceptibility &c., 68-9, 166, 227-228, 311, 9-22, 32-4, 9, 41, 53, 356-9, 390-6, 412, 508, 17.
Valet, see Hermann.
Visit to Wagner, 77*n*, 8, 83, 100, 120, 5, 6, 8, 32*n*, 3-47, 50, 75, 6, 247*n*, 90, 377-8, 409, 66, 76, 99; another suggested, 166, 71*n*, 7*n*, 218*n*, 28, 49, 354, 7, 8, 67, 407. See Basle, Paris.
Will, test., 290, 518.
LITERARY WORKS, WAGNER'S, 5, 10, 40, 92, 131, 70-1, 80, 239, 41*n*, 3*n*, 361, 467, 85*n*, 512, 20:—
Art and Revolution, 42.
Art-work of the Future, 84, 5, 143*n*, 512, 3.
Autobio. Sketch, 94*n*, 246.
Beethoven, 520.
Communication, 56, 78, 95, 131, 158, 244, 6, 62, 70, 7, 9, 434, 99, 521.
Conducting, On, 361.
Explanatory Programmes, 165, 389-390: *Eroica*, 60; *Holl. ov.*, 107, 247*n*, 92, 4-5, 300, 3, 61; *Loh. prel.*, 107, 247*n*, 361; *Ninth Sym.*, 165; *Tannh. ov.*, 107, 264*n*, 304.
Flying Dutchman Guide (*Remarks*), 239-40, 54, 70, 83, 4.
German Opera, 513.
Iphig. in Aulis, 268, 360-4, 72*n*.
Jesus of Nazareth, 51.
Judaism in Music, 76-7.
Music applied to Drama, 180-2, 4*n*.
News-letters, Paris, 165*n*, 491*n*.
Nibelungen-Myth, 50, 2, 427.
Opera and Drama, 44, 9, 95*n*, 127, 171, 80, 253, 400, 38, 68, 521.
Oper. poetry and comp., 121*n*.
Overture, On the, 362.
Posthumous papers, 241, 417.
Sieger, Die, 32, 92*n*.
Tannhäuser Guide, 225, 497.
LITERARY WORKS, WAGNER'S—*cont.*
Theatre at Zurich, 77*n*, 120*n*, 218*n*, 272.
Volksblätter articles, 51.
Wieland, 44, 177.
Lobe, J. C., 69*n*.
Lodge, Sir Oliver, 22-3*n*.
Loewe, Karl, 515.
Loge, 14, 86, 213-4, 378; mus. themes, 193, 276, 412-5.
LOHENGRIN, 177, 269, 305, 448, 503:—
Cuts, 204-5*n*, 475-7, 84-8.
Fees, 155, 90, 5, 7, 338, 484.
Herald, 205*n*, 13, 478, 87*n*; at Zurich, 109*n*.
Hero, 270, 475, 88; Farewell, 269, 483; Narration, 269, 484-8.
Introit, act iii, 106, 8, 10, 4, 67, 266-7.
Judgment-theme, 380.
Liszt on, 201-2, 69, 78-80; 'Carolyszt,' 244, 61, 302.
Performances: Breslau, 206*n*, 395*n*, 508; Carlsruhe, 205*n*; Cassel (non-), 215; Cologne, 206*n*, 373; Darmstadt, 206*n*, 29, 339-40, 477; Frankfort, 85, 206*n*, 20-1*n*, 339-40; Hamburg, 206*n*; Leipzig fiasco, 155, 61, 90, 5-213, 21*n*, 309-12, 21, 56, 93; Stettin, 206*n*; Weimar, 79, 120, 39, 48, 9, 67*n*, 337, 9, 41, 96, 476-7 (see Prod.); Wiesbaden, 140, 8, 90, 204*n*, 6*n*, 475-7.
Performing-rights for sale &c., 189-91, 205-11, 313, 35, 98, 473.
Poem, 277, 439-40, 78; read at Zurich, 106-7; variants, 487*n*.
Prelude, 216*n*, 362, 475, 7; at Gewandhaus, 196, cf. 199, 201; W. longs to hear, 102, 8, 10, 2-4, 417, 75—opinion of, 114, 475.
Production, Weimar, orig., 118, 21, 146*n*, 206*n*, 475-89.
Scenery &c., 205, 8, 475-7, 89.
Scores: full, 68, 182, 90,—MS. presented to Liszt, 290; pfte, 163, 92; vocal and pfte arrgmts, 190-2, 207, 363, 469-73.
Selection, concert, Zurich, 108-, 60, 165, 204, 307, 417.
Sketch, MS. mus., 487*n*.
Split act iii, 477, 9.
Spread of, 163, 89-90, 202-6, 10, 215, 30, 313, 37-8, 51, 90, 4-5, 8, 476, 7.
Stahr on, 81, 213, 439, 40.

LOHENGRIN—*continued.*
Textbook, Weimar, 44, 245*n*, 478-489; sale, 190, 482.
Wagner longs to hear whole opera, 102, 8, 10, 3, 20, 5, 6, 208, 10, 229, 475-7; opinion of, 190, 206-207, 476-7.
London, 136, 49-50, 90, 211, 393; Opera in, 148*n*, 248*n*, 59, 453-66; W.'s Philh. season, v, 109, 33, 340*n*, 354, 7, 61, 3, 8, 94*n*, 9, 401, 12, 7.
Love, 12, 215, 60-3, 4*n*, 300, 65-6, 411; *versus* Power, 52, 213, 375, 381-2, 404.
Lucerne, 40, 370; Lake of, 132*n*, 44-145, 335, 6, 71.
Lucifer's crown, 478-82.
Ludwig II., 41, 55, 128.
Lumley, Benj., 453-66.
Lüttichau, von, 42, 3, 98, 493*n*.

M.

Mainz (=Mayence), 106, 206*n*, 331*n*.
Malibran, 248*n*.
Mannheim: band, 160, 2, 3; theatre, 206*n*.
Mariafeld, 74-7, 127-31.
Marie Antoinette, 404.
Mario, 273, 454.
Marr (Weimar regie), 260*n*.
Massow, von, 355-6.
Maximilian, King, Bav., 224, 5.
MEISTERSINGER, DIE, 177, 266, 351, 510; overture, 362, 468.
Melody, 170-1, 9, 93, 275, 416; Verse-, 179, 80, 214, 400, 3, 4, 467-8.
Mendelssohn, Felix, 163, 97*n*, 204*n*, 218, 377*n*, 453, 95*n*, 520; *Allegro giojoso*, 378; *Hebrides* ov., 514; *Lobgesang*, 366*n*; *Loreley*, 165; *Melusine* ov., 178*n*; *Reformation* sym., 515.
Meser, C. F. (pub.), 225*n*, 98*n*, 300, 469-70.
Methfessel (conductor), 366-9.
Metternich, Princess, 450.
Meyer (soprano), 200.
Meyer-Stadler, Zurich, 103.
,, & Zeller, Zurich, 397*n*.
Meyerbeer, 232, 308*n*, 12*n*, 64*n*, 493*n*; and *Holl.*, 318, 490-1; and Johanna W., 454, 7, 66, 93*n*, 8; and Liszt, 165*n*, 71, 271, 4, (308), 318, 9, 24, 44*n*: *Etoile du Nord*, 165*n*, 330, 98; *Huguenots*, 465, 518-20; *Prophète*, 149*n*, 65, 274, 457-8, 65; *Robert le Diable*, 274, 466, 91*n*; *Struensee* ov., 165.
Meysenbug, Malwida von, 301.
Michaelson, agent, 205.
Milanollo, Teresa, viol., 161.
Mildes, the, Weimar singers, 200, 58-259, 70, 2-4, 90, 340*n*, 478.
Mime, 25-39, 57, 72*n*, 185-6*n*, 94, 414, 21-8, 44-5; "song," 168, 86*n*.
"Mirabeau as draper," 101.
Mitchell, box-agent, 462, 4.
Mitleid (compassion), 32, 63, 92, 227, 229, 63, 85, 8, 95, 315, 36, 59, 62, 404, 15.
Moritz, 79, and Frau, 149.
Morning Post, London, 460, 2*n*.
Moscheles, 201*n*.
Moser, Andreas, *J. Joachim*, 167.
Motives, Musical, 31, 119, 76, 84*n*, 185, 7, 222*n*, 66, 362, 4, 75, 6, 84, 506, 16, 20; misleading labels, 269, 276*n*, 92, 373-87, 412-5. See RING &c.
Mottl, Felix, 289*n*.
Mozart, 84, 243, 319, 64, 452, 3, 510: *Don Giov.*, 466, 519, 20—overt., 362; *Idom.*, 254; 'Jupiter' sym., 218; *Titus*, 165.
Müller, Alex., 73, 133; and daughters, 110, 2, 39.
Müller, Franz (Weimar), 73, 80, 95*n*, 482.
Müller, Hermann (pub.), 300.
Munich, 135*n*, 61, 304; Court-theatre, 106, 89, 206*n*, 23-5, 402, 74.
Muri, 105.
"Murls" and "Padisha," 167*n*, 333.
"Music of the Future," 76, 163, 8*n*, 196*n*, 510.
"Music-dramas," 81.
Musical World, London, 149*n*, 96*n*, 211*n*, 324, 66*n*, 9*n*, 456*n*, 8*n*, 63-4, 501.
Musik, Die, Berlin, 42*n*, 66*n*, 136*n*, 198*n*, 217, 307-8*n*, 12*n*, 9*n*, 39*n*, 450, 89, 91*n*, 519.
Musikalisches Wochenblatt, 116*n*, 374*n*, 85*n*, 515.

N.

Naples, 155.
Napoleon I., 96, 406.
,, III., 172.
Natural science, 22-3*n*, 129, 32, 41, 151, 3, 444, 5, 80.
Nesselrode, 163.

Neue Berl. Mus. Ztg, 219, 366*n*.
Neue freie Presse, 85.
Neue Mus. Ztg, Stuttgart, 487*n*.
Neue Zeitschrift, 74*n*, 7*n*, 96, 7, 101, 102, 35*n*, 7*n*, 43*n*, 64, 5, 8*n*, 89*n*, 96, 199, 202*n*, 4, 19, 25, 35-, 305*n*, 11, 340*n*, 1, 5*n*, 61, 4, 467, 8, 70, 2, 491*n*, 502, 5.
Neujahrsblatt, see Steiner.
New York concerts, 211*n*.
Nibelungen, rival works, 70, 499 ; see Dorn. W.'s, see RING.
Nibelungenlied, 46*n*, 81, 439, 501.
Nice, 156, 7.
Niedermann, W., Zurich, 110.
Nietzsche, F., (32), 453, 520.
Nohl, Ludwig, 243*n*, 511*n*.
Norns, 56, 62, 86, 432, 3, 41 ; scene, 22, 35*n*, 8, 44, 58, 61, 3, 131, 68, 208*n*, 429, 32, 6, 48.
Novello & Co., 297*n*, 409.
Nuitter, Charles, 301.
Nuremberg pfte-school, 237, 42, 408*n*, 512-8, 21.
Nutt, Alfred, 480.

O.

Observateur Belge, 392*n*.
Oderzeitung, 395*n*.
Odin, 39, 431.
Oesterlein, N., 334*n*.
Oetlishausen, Switzerland, 164.
Orchestra, strength of, 104-6, 9, 60, 4, 216, 31, 2, 65*n*, 9, 74, 90, 3, 7, 9, 303, 66-70, 474-5, 7.
Orchestration, 62, 121-2, 77-8, 80, 3-4, 200, 16-8, 21-2, 31-2, 65, 9, 74-6, 281-2, 6, 91-303, 74, 6, 405, 16, 75, 506.
Orders and crosses, 149, 66, 250.
Orelli, Aloys von, 105.
Ortrud, 148, 9, 340, 404, 84, 5, 8-9, 503.
Ott-Imhof, Zurich, 105.
,, Usteri, ,, ,, , 112
Oulibicheff, 254.
Overtures, v, 361-3, 451, 513, 4.

P.

Palestrina, 270, 515.
Paris, 109, 40, 77, 90, 393 ; Chamber-music, 170, 266 ; Concerts, 301, 90 ; Conserv. band, 112 ; Ital. Op., 455 ; reunion in, 154-6, 69-73 ; *Tannh.*, 10, 7, 170, 301, 450 ; Théâtre Lyrique, 170.
PARSIFAL, 32, 511, 5-8, 20 ; Grail theme, 379, 515 ; Kundry, 437—'Ritt,' 511, 5 ; "Leitfaden," 385, 387 ; Liebesmahl - theme, 515-8 ; 'Reiner Thor,' 31.
Parzival and Herzeleide, 26, 437.
Parzival, Wolfram's, 479-82.
Passport difficulties, 116, 56, 67, 72, 210, 77.
Patersi, Mme, 169.
Pätsch, Weimar singer, 478.
Peps, dog, 138, 47, 73.
Peretti, tenor, 475.
Persiani, Mme, 454.
Pesth, 161 ; Wagner-Liszt concert, 517.
Petzold, bandmaster, 105, 6.
Philistines, 78, 105, 13, 29, 31, 41-2, 167*n*, 75, 206, 7, 24, 8, 355, 506-7, 509.
PIANOFORTE WORKS, *Wagner's*, 185, 448-53 ; Album-sonata, 131, 85*n*, 448-50 ; Polonaise, 451 ; Sonata in B flat, early, 451-3, 510-1, 3.
Pichon, barytone, 109.
Piwko, Dr, Danzig, 69*n*.
Planers, Minna's parents, 337.
Pohl, R., 163-8, 91, 9, 200, 4-5, 209-10, 342*n*, 89, 469, 509 ; Carlsruhe brochure, 165-6, 321 ; wife, 163, 341.
Poles, exiled, 451.
Police, 42, 98, 115-6, 8, 23, 6-7, 34, 137*n*, 42, 56, 67, 70, 2, 470*n*.
Politics, 64-5, 116, 23, 37-8, 42 ; see Art.
Polonius, 439.
Posen, *Tannh.* at, 102, 202*n*.
Pourtalès, Countess, 450.
Praeger, Ferd., 185-7.
Prague theatre, 206*n*.
Presentation : goblet, 110, 2 ; snuff-box, 112*n*, 49.
Pressburg, 161.
Professors, 128, 32, 397, 510.
Programme-music, 182, 254, 303, 512, 513, 4, 20.
Programmes, concert, 107-8, 60, 3, 5, 363, 6, 514.
Pruckner, Dionys, 164, 6, 8*n*.
Prussia, King, 307, 20, 9, 31, 46, 53 ; Crown Prince, 308 ; Pss Augusta, 73, 102, 21, 319, 39, 51.
Pusinelli, Dr, 73.

Q.

Queen's Bench court, 454-65.

R.

Radecke, Robert, 505.
Radium, 22-3*n*.
Raff, Joachim, 137*n*, 43.
Ramann, Lina: *Franz Liszt*, 166*n*, 226*n*, 37-8, 42*n*, 75*n*, 321*n*, 32*n*, 408, 10, 511*n*, 4, 5-8; Liszt's *Ges. Schr.*, edit., 237-47, 513, 8-21,—see *Holländer* essay.
Rameau, 446-7.
Reclam (pub.), 243*n*, 406, 512.
Redemption, 32, 50-2, 8, 92, 124, 249; see Woman.
Redenden Künste, Die, 379*n*.
Redern, Count, 308*n*, 490-1.
Reincarnation, 92-3, 405.
Reissiger, G., 498.
Rémenyi, violinist, 167.
'Reminiscences,' mus., 178*n*, 84*n*, 194*n*, 266*n*, 376-8, 404-11, 511-8; auto-, 31-2, 269, 300, 80, 405*n*, 514.
Renunciation, 91, 261, 3, 4*n*, 417, 434.
Reuss-Belce, Frau, 403*n*.
Revolution, 64-5, 73, 159, 380-2.
Révue trimestrielle, 392*n*.
RHEINGOLD, DAS:—
Composition, 155, 7, 68, 74-7, 364, 448; 'draft,' 177-88, 91, 3-5, 214, 21-3; introduction, 177-81, 216, 22, 362, 405, 14.
Motives, mus., 17, 168, 76, 8, 81-3, 187, 93, 231, 365, 77-8, 405, 508; so-called 'Renunciation,' 374-84, 409; Spear, 374, 80; Walhall, 187, 8, 93, 231-2, 374. See Loge.
Music, in general, 11, 12*n*, 122, 231-2, 403, 49, 511; Wagner's opinion of, 195, 365*n*, 400.
Score: Full, 178, 80, 93,—work at, 215-8, 20-3, 30 (ended), 317,—fair copy, 195, 220-3, 30, 2-3, 371, 90 (ended),—lent to Liszt, 341, 71, 91-2, 6, 407, 508, 15; Vocal (pfte), 6*n*, 8-9, 11, 221, 32, 391, (471).
Text, 4, 6*n*, 8-9, 11-5, 60, 84, 402, 403, 29, 33, 41-2.
Rhine, 166, 213, 331*n*, 5*n*, 88, 504.
Rhinedaughters, 9, 14, 58-9, 62, 86, 90, 178-9, 81, 206, 375, 8.
Rhythm, mus., 178-80, 5-6*n*, 231, 65, 269, 75, 93*n*, 4, 6, 400, 13*n*, 51-2.
Richter, Hans, 370.
Richterswyl, 145.
RIENZI, 129, 91, 231, 78, 451, 511, 513, 4; at Berlin, 328, 43*n*, 491, 495*n*; *Friedens-Marsch*, 107, 94; overt. for milit. band, 308*n*; Vendetta-motive, 520.
Rietz, Julius, 196, 8, 200-5, 9.
Riga, 206*n*, 46, (318), 473, 94*n*, 5*n*, 520.
Ring (in the drama), 12-5, 57, 9, 188, 213, 375, 81-2, 423, 7, 8, 30; see Hoard.
RING DES NIBELUNGEN, DER (for separate parts see *Rheingold* &c.):—
Dedications, 43, 75, 84, 170.
Editions, 5-11, 17-9, 44, 8*n*, 51*n*, 70-4, 92, 441, 3, 85*n*; Preface to first, 70-2, 439, 305*n*.
Evolution of, 12-3, 8-9, 32-5, 43-, 60, 5-6, 158, 425-6, 35-8.
"Gods-myth," 35-9, 47-53, 6-60, 63-4, 86, 92, 213-4, 403-4, 14, 426-37, 9.
Money, not for, 3-4, 68, 78, 191, 5, 372, *cf.* 338, 96.
Music for, 3, 67, 9, 71, 6, 82, 114-5, 119-20, 32*n*, 44, 55, 7, 68, 70, 174-7, 80, 92, 209-11, 20, 305, 390, 411, 39, 47-8, 68; interruption of, 5, 8, 10, 411, 504; "new method" of composing, 182-3, 218, 20-3, 30-1.
Poem, 3 *et seq.*, 277: fair copy, 4-5, 19, 289; as literature, 5, 8, 10, 19, 21, 66-72, 6-7, 80-93, 438-48; paralipomena, 8, 18-24, 91-3; privately printed, 4, 67-74, 9, 80, 439, 47-8, 99, 500; read aloud, 74-9, 94, 129, 41, 4, 6, 67-70.
Poem, Revisions of, 4-5, 11-66, 91-3, 289, 360, 83, 424-38.
Representation, future, 10, 71, 8, 114-5, 7, 40, 4, 67-9, 76, 84, 209, 214, 370-3, 4*n*, 400-3, 11, 38-9, 447-8, 77, 504; see also Bayreuth.
Score: Full, 6-8, 10, 6, 51*n*, 375*n*, 385*n*, 473, 85*n*; Vocal (pfte), 6, 7*n*, 16, 385*n*.
Textbook, 6-7, 72, 379*n*, 421, 41, 485*n*.
Ritter family, 54, 116, 35, 43, 389, 399: Alex., 41, 116, 209 (?), 341*n*, 389, 470, 504; Carl, 54, 73, 80, 102*n*, 43, 91, 364-5, 71, 88-9, 488, 508*n*, 9; Emilie, 139, 47; Francisca (Wagner's niece), 341, 57; Frau Julie, 69*n*, 73, 100, 16*n*, 83, 6, 209.
Rockstro, W. S., 519.

Roeckel, August, 12-4, 32, 73, 84, 90-1, 102, 5, 14, 27, 41*n*, 57, 83, 212-5.
Roesch, F., 116*n*.
Roger, tenor, 190*n*.
Rome, 512, 6, 20.
Rome, French trombonist, 161*n*.
Ronconi, singer, 454.
Roqueplan, Paris dir., 455, 6.
Rordorf, Henriette, 368.
Rossini, 84; *Semiramide*, 454; *Tancredi*, 149*n*, 458*n*, 505; *Tell*, 499.
Rotterdam, 169*n*; festival, 331*n*, 2, 358*n*, 67, 90-1.
Rubinstein, Anton, 237*n*, 341, 407*n*; *Ocean* sym., 200-1*n*.
Rühlemann, J., 300.
Russia, 116, 62.

S.

S. Gallen, 105.
S. Gothard, 157.
S. Mark's, Venice, 406.
S. Moritz, 150-5, 76, 97, 466-8.
Sainte-Beuve, 235.
Saintsbury, G. (pub.), 249*n*.
San Marte (A. Schulz), 481-2.
Sauppe, Hofrath, 79.
Saxony, King, 119, 55, 209-10, 29; at Weimar, 125-6; & Minna, 342.
Schäffer, singer, 501.
Schaffhausen, 105.
Scenery, natural, 122, 41, 5, 8, 51, 4, 166, 331*n*, 71.
Scheffer, Ary, 169*n*.
Schemann, Dr L., 273*n*.
Schiller, 165, 79, 226; *Wallenstein*, 499. See Goethe.
Schindelmeisser, Louis, 102*n*, 5, 12*n*, 149, 94, 206*n*, 21*n*, 9, 312*n*, 7-9, 39, 447, 69*n*, 73-8, 95*n*.
Schlesinger (Berlin pub.), 364*n*.
Schleuchzer, C., 95.
Schloemp, E. (pub.), 385*n*.
Schlösser, Dr Rudolf, 35.
Schmidt, C. C. (?), Leipzig dir., 282*n*.
,, ,Gustav, 136, 206*n*, 20*n*, 82*n*, 339-40, 96, 474.
Schöll, Hofrath, 79.
Schöneck, Gustav, 101-2, 476.
Schopenhauer: copy of *Ring* poem, 17, 70, 1*n*, 84-9, 153, 440-6; and Wagner, 19*n*, 84-5, 8-9, 91-2, 132, 85*n*, 213, 28, 55, 64, 338, 97-8, 400, 11, 7.
Schott, basso, Leipzig, 200.
Schott & Co. (mus. pub.), 7*n*, 375*n*, 379*n*; Frau Betty, 449.
Schröder-Devrient, 248*n*, 58, 73.
Schubert: *Alf. & Estr.*, 247, 8; Sonatas, 409-10; Songs, 148—*Wanderer*, 409.
Schuberth & Co. (mus. pub.), 515.
Schulz, Albert, see San Marte.
Schumann, 136*n*, 513; & Brahms, 168*n*: *Genoveva*, 198*n*; *Manfred*, 165, cf. 254.
Schweiz, 145.
Schwerin theatre, 284-6, 302, 474.
Scotland (*Holl.*), 245.
Scott, R. S., 249*n*.
Seelisberg, 336, 71.
Semper, Gottfried, 76.
Senta, 249-52, 6-64.
Seydelmann, cond., 395*n*.
Shakespeare, 403, 13; *Hamlet*, 93, 250, 2, 352, 403, 39; *Lear*, 519; *Othello*, 32, 250.
Siegfried, 25-33, 44-7, 55-6, 9-61, 87-8, 90-1, 243*n*, 421-7, 35-9, 44, 6; & Parsifal, 26, 31-2, 437; & Wotan, 24, 47, 50, 3, 6-61, 93, 379, 411-2, 430, 3*n*, 4-7.
SIEGFRIED:—
Earliest form (1851), 22*n*, 7*n*, 33-9, 53-8, 60, 5, 8-9, 421*n*, 6-38; draft, 69*n*.
Fear-lesson, 25-6, 8, 33, 91*n*, 414, 421-6, 9, 38, 44.
Music, 32, 65, 371, 411: prelude, 362, 85*n*; act i, 31, 168*n*, 378, 413, 4; act ii, 185-6*n*, 222*n*, 377*n*; act iii, 178*n*, 376, 8-81, 412-3, 5, 31.
Poem:—1853 form, 23*n*, 5-33, 56, 87-8, 383, 411, 21-38, 44-5; 1856 form, 32-3, 424-6.
Siegfried's Tod (precursor of *Gdg*):—
Earliest form of poem (1848, see *Ges. Schr.* ii), 36-7, 44*n*, 6-9, 55*n* (?), 427, 32*n*.
Fair copy (1849), 40-54: "Machtlos" gloss, 51-4, 60-1, 3-4, 92, 426, 34; "Selige Sühnung" variant, 50-1, 3.
Grand opera, as, 43-4, 9.
Music contemplated for, 53-4, 65, (279-80).
Replica (1850) & hypothetic interim revision (1851), 39, 41, 6*n*, 7, 9, 53-65.
Vendetta-motive, 55, 60, 437.
"Siegfrieds, The two," 5, 9, 11, 24, 33*n*, 53, 60, 4-5, 209, 426.

Siegmund, 83, 433*n*; & Sieglinde, 16-24, 56, (74), 86-7, 365, 74, 402*n*, 403, 4, 10, 1, 3*n*, 25, 37, 42, 3; sword-winning, 16-7, 24, 374-5, 380-4.
Sienna, 516-7.
Silistria, 336.
Simrock, Carl, 481-2.
Sims Reeves, 248*n*.
Singers, 148, 52, 65*n*, 200, 14, 20*n*, 271-4. See Actors.
Sitten (Sion) festival, 365-70, 478.
Solothurn, 105.
SONATA, W.'s, see PFTE WORKS.
"Sonder-" & "Gesammt-kunst," 143, 63, cf. 271.
Sondershausen, 206*n*.
Sontag, Henriette, 454, 62, 72.
Spear, see Wotan's.
Speech-melody, 83, 467; see M.
Spezzia, 156, 7, 371.
Spohr, 158, 215, 45, 79, 515; *Last Judgment*, 368.
Spontini, 243, 308*n*, 19.
Spyri, 73, (109), 139.
Stabreim, 23*n*, 76, 432, 4, cf. 439.
Stahr, Adolf, 73, 80-2, 5, 90, 8*n*, 213, 35, 438-40, 6, 7.
Steiner-Schweizer, A., 40-, 51, 2*n*, 78*n*, 98, 105*n*, 32*n*, 71, 219*n*, 368*n*, 371, 98.
Stern's Conserv., Berlin, 391*n*.
Stettin theatre, 206*n*.
Stockar-Escher, Clementine, 97-9, 211.
Strassburg, 168-9; cathedral, 169, 172-4, 516-8.
Strophic test, (17), 35-9, 55, 8-63, 427, 430, 2, 3, 5, 45.
Stuttgart, 106, 487*n*.
Sullivan, A. S., 266*n*, 377*n*.
Sulzer, Jakob, 40-4, 55, 73, 105, 12, 132-3, 9, 71, 211, 356, 63, 71, 98-9.
Sunday Times, London, 461.
Switzerland, 114-7, 22-3, 42, 4, 55, 370; see Zurich.
Symbols, 174, 212, 33, 324, 60, 411, 4.
SYMPHONY, W.'s early, 513.

T.

Tageblatt, Leipzig, 196.
Talleyrand, envoy at Weimar, 146.
Tamburini, 454.
TANNHÄUSER:—
Berlin negotiations, 99-102, 18, 207, 225, 34, 306, 10-59, 70, 89, 93, 394*n*, 6, 9, 446, 66, 91-8.
TANNHÄUSER—*continued.*
Carolyszt on, 244, 54, 302.
Cuts, 497.
Dresden production, orig., 476.
Fees, 155, 9*n*, 88-90, 223-5, 315, 317, 20, 2*n*, 34, 8, 53-6, 469*n*; see Spread.
Hero, 244, 72, 474, 5.
Illustrirte article, 97, 8.
Introd. act iii entire, 108, 266*n*, *cf.* 122*n*.
"March," 107, 219.
Milit. arrgmts, 308*n*, 491.
New ending, 159*n*, 323*n*.
Overture, 302, 62, 514: at Carlsruhe fest., 160, 3, 5; London, 211*n*, 465; Munich, 225*n*, 304; New York, 211*n*; Sitten (withdrawn), 367; Zurich, 108, 14, 35*n*, 219, 417.
Paris: rumours, 170; version, 17, 66*n*, 470—fiasco, 10, 301, 450.
Performances: Augsburg, 149*n*, 223; Breslau, 189*n*; Bromberg, 102; Carlsruhe, 159; Cassel, 158; Cologne, 190*n*, 372; Frankfort, 85, 136, 48, 282*n*, 474; Hamburg, 155; Königsberg, 190*n*; Leipzig, 195-7, 203-5, 466; Munich, 223-5, 315; Posen, 102, 202*n*; Schwerin, 206*n*, 474, 497; Weimar, 79, 139, 48, 9, 200, 79, 357; Wiesbaden, 469*n*, 474, 97; Zurich, 417.
Performing-rights on mortgage, 207, 10, 313*n*, 35, 98-9.
Pfte arrgmts, 192, 266*n*, 469-70.
Poem, 17, 81, 98*n*, 177, 244, 54, 77, 439, 81; read aloud, Zurich, 106-7.
Score, autographed, 217, 90.
"Singspiel," as, 101-2.
Spread, 99-102, 18, 27, 43, 9*n*, 75, 188-90, 202, 3, 6, 9, 12, 23, 313, 318, 20, 35, 7-8, 49, 51, 5, 72, 390, 4-5, 8, 469, 74, 93-4.
Textbook, 479, 82; sale, 189*n*, 225*n*.
Tappert, W., 307*n*, 449*n*, 50, 515.
Taubert, K. G. W., 307, 11, 495; *Macbeth*, 505.
Tausig, Carl, 184.
Technique, 170, 81-2, 265-78, 92-4, 296*n*, 8-305, 61, 4, 448-53, 67-8, 471, 506-10.
Teichmann, Hofrath, 328-9.
Tell's chapel, 145.
Teplitz, 161.

Theory, 153*n*, 80, 90*n*, 213-4, 71, 3, 361, 466-8.
Thiele, "trombone genius," 106.
Thun, 105.
Tichatschek, 149*n*, 272, 3.
Tieck, Ludwig, 163.
Times, London, 455*n*, 7*n*, 62.
Tonkünstler convention, 406, 87*n*.
Torchlight serenade, 117, 50.
TRISTAN UND ISOLDE, 5, 70*n*, 178*n*, 300, 73, 7*n*, 86, 410, 6, 511, 4, 7; first idea, 32, 338, 411; "Liebestod," 62, 299, 301, 63, 511, 4; non-perf., Vienna, 10, Carlsruhe, 159; vocal score, 468.
Truhn, 505.
Turin, 156, 7.
"Twilight-man," 187.
Tyskiewicz, 202, 392*n*.

U.

Uhlig, Theodor, 41, 53-4, 64-5, 9*n*, 95-7, 143, 280-9; death, 4, 66, 131, 285-9; *Letters to*, 64, 7-8, 118, 158-9, 79, 425, 6, 86*n*, 9, (see Fischer, F. Heine)—missing, 53.

V.

Vafthrudnersmal, 39.
Valais (=Wallis), 365-70, 478.
Valkyries, 18, 45, 50, 61, 81, 502; "Hojotoho," 86, 408; parentage, 17, 442.
Vandyck, 259, 72.
Varnhagen von Ense, 89.
Vegtamskvida, 431.
Venice, 100, 33, 406.
Venusberg, 301, 83*n*.
Verdi, 505.
Verse, 16, 76, 9, 83, 179, 226, 439, 445, 67-8, 84, 5; see Strophic.
Vevey, 365, 71.
Vienna, 116, 61, 225, 454, 6, 7, 61, 3; opera-house, 189, 206*n*, 317; *Tristan*, 10.
Villeneuve, 54.
Violin *v.* pfte, 153, 4, 61, 449, 50.
Vischer, F. T., *Kritische Gänge*, 81, 439, 501, 2.

W.

Wagner, Albert, 149-50, 312, 23-7, 329*n*, 58, 89, 492, 8; and England, 148*n*, 50, 323, 453-66; letters, 323-6, 7*n*, 60, 457-8, 60-1, 2*n*, 5; third daughter, 457, 8-9*n*; wife, 459*n*.
Wagner, Francisca, 116, 341, 57, 89, 455, 8*n*.
Wagner, Johanna, 152, 341*n*, 89, 453-66, 500, 1; letters, 148*n*, 455-6, 61-2, 465, 6, 93*n*; and *Tannh.*, 136, 148-9, 312, 23, 6, 57, 465, 92, 6, 8, 504-5.
Wagner, Minna, 77*n*, 99-100, 28, 39, 147, 52, 5-6, 7*n*, 62, 71-2, 86, 229, 371-3, 96, 7*n*, 8; as diplomatist, 312, 36-45, 58; parents, 337.
WAGNER, RICHARD:—
Appearance, 98, 137, 87, 373.
and Christianity, 124, 57, 73, 4, 208*n*, 28, 64, 475, 517.
Conductor, 94, 106-14, 28-9, 31, 42, 166*n*, 218*n*, 9, 343, 61, 3-4, 8-70, 372, 475, 6.
Death, 4, 518; and, 12, 3, 7, 52, 92, 382-3; longing for, 4, 80, 127, 157, 66, 94, 203, 9, 11, 4, 33, 53, 255, 371, 411, *cf.* 188.
Diet, 69, 130, 4, 43, 52, 75.
Divan, 100, 83.
Domesticity, 99-100, 23, 52, 86, 336-40, 72; see Zurich homes.
Dress, 137, 47, 50.
Exile, 42, 96, 100, 15-7, 27, 32, 4, 156, 67, 358*n*, 90, 411, 69, 77, 493; efforts for amnesty, 118-27, 140, 6, 209-10, 3*n*, 29, 342-5, 8, 358.
Eye-strain, 100, 51, 3-4, 84*n*, 94, 215-6, 20, 30, (cf. 373), 411-2, 66; see Health.
Fame etc., 4, 69, 95-7, 109-13, 38, 144, 233, 318, 28*n*, 37-8, 50, 66, 390-5, 476.
General characteristics and traits, 3-4, 67-8, 73*n*, 8-9, 89, 97, 106, 110, 3, 9, 23-5, 30, 3, 5, 7-8, 142-3, 6, 7*n*, 53, 9, 66, 72, 4-5, 186, 9, 93, 5, 207, 9-12, 5, 7, 9, 221*n*, 7-9, 317, 28, 33, 50, 2-3, 357-9, 68-70, 3, 94, 6, 412, 74, 476, 7, 95-6, 506, 21.
Gratitude, 107, 22, 4, 38, 43, 50, 168, 72-3, 208 (*cf.* 226-7), 304, 305*n*, 17, 8-9, 25, 8, 30, 42-4, 6, 358, 73, 92, 3, 474-7, 84, 9, 94, 6.
Handwriting, 41-3, 51, 71, 7, 216-217, 20, 30, 2-3, 441.
Health, 4, 32, 66, 7, 70, 5, 94, 100, 113, 4, 23, 30, 4, 5, 7, 50-8, 88, 193-5, 212, 5, 33, 412, 68.
Hospitality, 112, 28, 35, 9, 41, 3, 147, 207, 365, 72, 478.

WAGNER, RICHARD—*continued.*
Humour, 3, 75, 117, 27, 49, 50, 5, 159, 72, 209, 15, 32, 363, 4, 8, 399, 407, 30, 8, 48, 516.
Insomnia, 110, 35, 56, 7, 203, 412.
Loneliness, 80, 118-9, 22-3, 7-35, 150, 5-8, 72, 5, 7, 207-8, 11, 28, 247, 9, 55, 63.
Manuscripts, unpubd letters &c., v, 33, 9-, 53-5, 65, 8-9, 91-2, 290, 334*n*, 5*n*, 430, 4, 49*n*, 50, 67, 483, 7*n*.
Misprints, horror of, 483-6, 8.
Money-matters, 4, 68, 71, 99-101, 103, 5, 14, 21, 7, 41, 3-4, 55, 71, 175, 87-92, 4, 5, 7-8, 205-8, 11-2, 219-20, 5, 7, 48, 78, 81, 307, 9, 312-3, 5, 7, 8, 25, 8*n*, 33-6, 8, 349, 53, 6, 7, 9, 65, 71, 88-95, 398-9, 447, 8, 69, 82, 90, 2.
Morning work, 4, 184-8, 95, 371-2.
Optimism and pessimism, 91-3, 124, 133, 88-9, 212-5, 33, 301, 38, 349-50, 82, 97, 411-2, 7.
Pianoforte, 129-32 (cf. 153-4), 168, 170-2, 221, 377, 450, 505-6; did *not* compose at, 184-7.
Portraits, 94-9, 115, 71, 475; photo., 96-7, 208*n*.
Publication venture, 189*n*, 469.
Reading, 132, 54*n*, 215; aloud, 67, 74-9, 103, 6-7, 20, 9, 31, 2, 41, 144, 6, 67-9, 448.
Restraint, artistic, 180-1, 232, 303, 411, 507, 10.
"School" (?), 113, 270-3, 467.
Singing, 129, 34, 40, 7, (152-3, 4), 184, 401, 48, 86.
Snuff, 149.
Speech-making, 110, 7.
Suicide, thinks of, 123, 56, 207, 11, 389, 507.
Teacher, as, 131-2, 81, 214, 7, 20-221*n*, 386, 400-1, 68, 505-10.
Travel, 123, 6, 32, 41, 4-6, 55-7, 166-73, 6, 233, 367, 484.
Walks, 75, 100, 34, 51-2, 4, 84, 6.
Weather, 91, 150, 72, 91, 360-1, 4.
Weeping, 147, 69, 209, 12, 33, 347.
Young talent, and, 71, 102*n*, 43, 365, 73, 466, 7, 71, 5; see Teacher.
Wagner-Museum, 289*n*, 334*n*.
,, Verein, 487*n*.
Wahnfried, 247*n*, 399, 483.
WALKÜRE, DIE,
Composition-'draft,' 360: act i, 330*n*, 5, 365-6, 71-88; act ii, 337*n*, 90, 6, 400-11, 508; act iii, 402*n*, 11-7.
Lisztian fables, 406-11, 511-2, 5.
Motives, mus., 373-84, 5*n*, 404-11: "Renunciation," 374-84, 7, 409; "Slumber," 412-5; Spear, 374, 380, 4; Walhall, 374, cf. *Rheingold*.
Music, in general, 223, 31, 2, 373, 381-2, 403, 16; Liszt's silence on, 401; Wagner's opinion of, 400-1, 416.
Poem, text, 15-24, 83, 7, 8, 442-3.
Prelude, 362, 5.
Score: Full, 17, 32, 216, 401, 5-7, 409, 16, 7—lent to Liszt, 400-1, 407, 515; pfte vocal, 17, 406, 16.
Wallis (=Valais), 365-70, 478.
Wallner, Franz, 101, 2.
Waltraute, 18; scene, 18, 45, 9, 60, 61, 2, 4, 93, 380.
Wanderer-scenes: Alberich, 56, 427-431; Erda, 63*n*, 88, 379, 87, 428, 431-5; Mime, 26-39, 56, 7, 423, 5, 428, 45; Siegfried, 435-7.
Warrant of Arrest: orig., 120; renewed, 98, 115-7, 26, 46, 355, 469.
Warsaw, 163.
Wartburgkrieg, 481.
Water-cure &c., 32, 65, 150-7, 76, 215, 336, 466.
Weber, 243, 66, 70, 1, 307*n*, 73, 405, 452: *Euryanthe*, 235,—ov., 208; *Freischütz*, 405,—ov., 218, 96-8,—Zamiel motive, 519, 20; *Oberon*, 405; Sonatas, 376-8, 409-10.
WEIMAR, 78-9, 122, 5, 36, 392*n*, 406:—
Bandsmen, 106, 13, 6, 64*n*, 290, 341*n*, 508, 9.
for Festspielhaus (?), 144.
Grand Duchess, Maria Paulowna, 73, 125, 278, 83, 90.
Grand Duke, Karl Alex. (at first, Her^{y}), 69, 125, 44, 229, 329, 42, 346, 8, 51, 498-9, 505; accession, 146; at Dresden, 126; Wagner writes, 125, 46, 210.
Grand Duke, Karl Fried., 119, 23, 125; death, 146.
Minna at, 337, 9-42, 5, 8, 96.
"School," 164*n*, 6-8 (cf. 217, 70), 505, 8-10, 20.
"Siegfried" for (?), 65.
Theatre, 70*n*, 3*n*, 9, 106, 18, 22 148, 9, 58, 90, 206, 35*n*, 48*n*, 258-60, 78-89, 304, 8-10, 51,

WEIMAR—*continued.*
475-89, 98-501; Liszt's difficulties, 139, 46, 260*n*, 333.
Weinlig, Chr. Theodor, 451-2, 510.
Weissheimer, Wendelin, 340*n*.
Wesendonks, the, 73, 131, 87, 448, 450; Mathilde, 131-2, 87, 232, 360,—*Letters to*, vi, 55*n*, 69*n*, 301; Otto, 105, 27, 8, 211, 398-9,—*Letters to*, 138, 44, 55.
Weston, Miss Jessie L., 431, 80-1.
Weymar'sche Zeitung, 234, 6, 47.
Wieprecht, W., 306-8.
Wiesbaden, 79; theatre, 106, 12*n*, 140, 473-7.
Wigand, Otto (pub.), 41, 53-4.
Wilhelmj, August, 450.
Will, Conzertmeister, 163.
Willes, the, 73, 5, 128-9; Eliza, *Reminisc.*, 74, 84-5, 8, 127-31, 139-40, 218*n*; François, 84-5, 9, 128, 9, 39-40, 2.
Willozewsky, A., 106*n*.
Winterthur, 99, 105, 35*n*; Library, 55*n*.
Wirsing, Dir., 101, 97, 202-5.
Wirth, Moritz, 374*n*.
WITTGENSTEIN, Pss Carolyne Sayn-, 77*n*, 9-80, 168-72, 218*n*, 88, 90*n*, 367, 483:—
Erudition &c., 236, 7, 43*n*, 8*n*, 251-4, 64*n*, 70, 90, 333, 478-82, 500-1.
Liszt's letters to, 78, 136-48, 61-3, 169*n*, 76, 247*n*, 313*n*, 31*n*, 5*n*, 56.
Literary collab. with L., 145*n*, 235-, 305*n*, 16, 30, 94-5, 478, 482, 8, 513.
"Longue vue," 248, 330, 46, 9, 393-4, 99.
Obstacles to marriage, 139, 71*n*, 227, 9, 52, 315, 30, 54.
Psychologic insight, 255-6, 60-3.
Writes to Wagner, 227*n*, 47-8, 62, 330, 48, 51*n*, 92*n*.
Wittgenstein, Eugene (cousin), 98*n*, 168, 9, 71.
Wittgenstein, Marie (Pss C.'s daughter), 161, 8-70, 227-8, 88, 350, 67.
"Wohlbekannte," 69, 199.
Wölfel, copyist, 391.
Wolff, Prof. O. L. B., 278, 81, 483, 485.
Wolfram, Clara (R. W.'s sister), 337.
Wolfram von Eschenbach, 478-82.
Wolzogen, Hans von, 17, 8, 27*n*, 30, 181, 382-6, (412-3), 424-6.
Woman, 20, 73, 97-9, 110, 4, 30-2, 154, 87, 228, 38, 55-7, 397*n*, 446; "redeeming," 52, 63, 92, 251, 261-4, 95-6, 338, 434.
Woronince, 511*n*.
Wotan, 13-5, 9, 37-8, 49-51, 3, 8, 62-3, 213, 411; Eye, 21-2, 4, 38, 403, 35; "Gedanke," (15), 20, 2, 437; Monologue, 88, 397, 400-5, 431; Spear, 9, 13*n*, 38, 57, 9, 426, 428, 36-7,—mus. theme, 193, 374, 380. See also Fricka; Wanderer.
Wurzburg theatre, 206*n*.
Wyss, Moritz von, 103, 366.

X.

"X" (various), 150, 210, 24, 324*n*, 328*n*, 30, 5.

Z.

Zellner, critic, 501*n*.
Zenker, 6*n*, 8*n*.
Zigesar, Intendant, 69, 73, 136, 48, 200, 83, 479, 82, 3, 4.
Zofingen, 105.
Zolling, Th., 76-7, 152*n*, 219, 397*n*.
Zug, Lake of, 146.
ZURICH:—
Allg. Mus. Gesellschaft, 40, 117; committee, 103-5, 9, 12; concerts, 94, 193-4, 208, 18-9, 363, 417.
Choral unions, 106, 42; Serenade by, 117.
Homes, Wagner's, 99-100, 17, 27, 128, 37, 43, 75, 83-5, 9, 91, 211, 28, 335, 8, 72, 98.
Inhabitants, 103, 5, 7, 9, 12-7, 9, 123, 7-33, 8, 42, 5, 50, 208, 218*n*, 335, 98-9.
Lake, 141, 5.
Localities: Casino, 106, 12, 218*n*; Escherhäuser, 99; Hôtel Baur, 74, 5, 8, 94, 135, 41; Theatre, 101, 9, 12, 3, 219, 86, 417, 73; Zeltweg, 99, 117, 28, 47.
Newspapers: *Eidgenössische*, 106-7, 109-11, 3, 7; *Neue Zür. Ztg*, 113, 117*n*.
Quartet evenings, 128, 417.
Wagner-festival concerts, 78, 94, 102-15, 23, 5, 8-9, 31, 2*n*, 4, 141-2, 76, 219, 306-7, 40, 63, 89, 474-5, 7.
Zutz, Engadine, 151.
Zwickau, 337.